STRICTURES

ON THE

Commentary and *Conference*

OF THE

Reverend Mr. DODD,

Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty:

WITH

REFLECTIONS

ON THE

Reverend Mr. HEATHCOTE's

USE of *REASON.*

By Mr. ANTININNY T.

Projicit ampullas dodonæoſque lebetas.

LONDON:

Printed for M. Folingsby, at the Seven Stars in Fleet-Street. M. DCC. LXV.

BRITISH MUSEUM

Strictures on the *Commentary* and *Conference* of the Rev. Mr. Dodd, Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majeſty; with Reflections on the Rev. Mr. Heathcote's *Uſe of Reaſon.*

AMidſt the great variety of commentaries on the Bible, which the Bookſellers have of late years bleſt the world with, retailing them out in weekly numbers, every patron has ſomething peculiar to his own to puff it off, and raiſe our expectation. The Bookſeller is properly the Commentator, the learned and pious Divine, whoſe name adorns the Title Page, being the collector only of the materials, his patron directing him what authors to gather from, having his eye to the ſale, which depends upon the credit, the doctrines he is to retail out, have in the world; for there is a faſhion in Religion, as well as in every thing elſe. Two interleaved Bibles and the MSS, of the great Mr. Locke; the interleaved Bibles of Drs. Waterland, Beaumont Church, and Aſſiſtance from learned Friends; the *diligence*, *candour* and *fidelity* of the Author, and inſufficiency of *all former attempts* of this kind, are the *blue-paper* recommendation of Mr. Dodd's Work. "The moſt unprejudiced candour will allow me to ſay that none of theſe attempts could *reaſonably* obſtruct the proſecution of my deſign, ſays Mr. Dodd." The good-

nature and modeſt diffidence of himſelf, in this ſentence, I would not cry up too much, becauſe I propoſe to make it my own apology for a commentary, that is to follow this learned Gentleman's. What my Brethren of the Comment may think of me, for the compliment paid their labours, I do not trouble my head about, being ſatisfied of the vaſt ſuperiority that my work will have over theirs. I was in hopes, on taking up the three or four firſt numbers of Mr. Dodd's Work, to have found the fruits of their extraordinary aſſiſtance, and more than common pains, in conſulting ſuch a number of *learned and copious expoſitions*, we have that formidable liſt of, at the end. But either the good man's opinion of his own abilities and *ſincerity* hath deceived him; or the multitude of his expoſitors have confounded him; or we are not to expect a dilucidation of the difficulties in the Bible, from the helps he boaſts of.

I might reaſonably object to his filling his notes with ſuch a variety of opinions, and mere *ipſe dixits*, it only tending to confound the Reader, and promote *Scepticiſm*; unleſs he could have given us a clue, that would have brought us ſafely out of the labyrinth he loſeth us in. The Gentleman is an entire ſtranger to me, I never ſo much as ſaw him, that I know of, nor I think above once or twice ever heard his name mentioned; nor have I the leaſt perſonal ill-will to him, and hope no one will attribute the few following remarks on his notes on the firſt chapter of Geneſis, to any unbecoming view,

view, when my only deſign is to reſcue it out of that profound darkneſs our Author envelops it in; and from the grievous miſtakes he makes upon it, beyond perhaps what any other Commentator hath done.

Gen. i. v. 1. *In the beginning.* This has been variouſly conſtrued, our author refers it to time, *in the beginning of time.* ראשית no doubt is *firſt* or *chief*, with reſpect to time, as well as in any other reſpect; tho' his references do not prove it, unleſs the fourth year of a reign that laſted but eleven, were the *beginning* of it, ſee Jer. xxviii. 1. But the creating things in the *beginning* of *time*, when time itſelf began, is making that beginning its own æra. *Heſiod* by εξ αρχης in his Theog. lin. 45, only makes his Gods coeval with the earth and heaven they ſprung from; or that they exiſted as ſoon as the other began to be, and is equivalent to τα πρωτα lin. 108. But John i. 1. *In the beginning was the Word*, cannot refer to time, for *The Word* was before all time. And if αρχη *Beginning* be there *the Supreme Eſſence*, the firſt cauſe of every thing elſe, it may in Geneſis mean the ſame. If it is only to add weight to the verb ברא, that *God created in a beginning the Heavens and the Earth*, i. e. gave them a beginnning, we keep clear of what ſounds ſo odd, of making things to begin in their beginning. The word muſt be predicated of the verb or noun following, that, *The God* εν αρχη *created*—Or that *God created in a beginning*; referring *beginning* to the crea-

tures, as Pſal. cii. 25. לפנים of *old* ברא is rendered to *create*, and is *to grow* or *produce* animals or vegetables, where the creature exiſted before, as to the materials it conſiſts of; and the *form* only is *created* or produced into being; for that numerical one, though the like of it might, never exiſted before. *To produce ſomething from nothing is an idea*, Mr. Dodd ſays, *which at beſt is extreamly dark and confuſed.* It is impoſſible we ſhould have a direct idea, or any but analogical ideas, of that eſſence which never began, or of his actions, powers, and attributes. We now ſee through a glaſs εν αινιγματι *by reflection*, reſemblance, or analogy only. The producing a new form, or doing ſomething that never was done before, is a reſemblance of what we would be underſtood to mean by *producing ſomething from nothing*, which we expreſs in ſhort by the word *create*; and that word, or *make*, are very intelligible, when applied, as Gen. i. 1, 2, to things that are ſaid to be *without form.* And the different ſenſe ברא is uſed in, Gen. i. 1, and v. 21, and in other parts of SS. is ſo far from juſtifying our Author's criticiſm, that it entirely overthrows it. In Gen. i. 1, it is an act of God, prior to all *formation*; and relates to the materials themſelves, of which the creatures are made; in other ſcriptures it relates only to *the making* the creatures. God's ſpirit, i. e. a ſpirit he himſelf made, both in form and ſubſtance, *makes* the creatures now; but *he made* the materials thoſe creatures conſiſt of. Pſal. civ.

civ. 30, "thou ſendeſt forth thy ſpirit, they *are created*, and thou reneweſt the face of the Earth :" they are made of præ-exiſtent matter, but Gen. i. 1, ſpeaks of that præ-exiſtent matter itſelf; which what elſe can it mean but abſolute creation? and the different ſenſe in v. 21. he talks of, is, the outward analogical ſenſe, which aſcertains the meaning, in the firſt verſe; for ſenſe or ſenſation is the ſource of our ideas, and from whence by analogy only we ſpeak intelligibly of God; and this makes it abſolutely neceſſary that words ſhould be uſed in what we call a different ſenſe, when ſpoken of what God does by himſelf, and what he does by ſecondary cauſes. Let me refer to that excellent writer, the Author of *Divine Analogy*, publiſhed in 1732, and he that denies this, is got over into the enemies quarters, whatever he may think of himſelf. Mr. Dodd is rendering the creation of the world uncertain. "I ſhould chuſe therefore, ſays he, to underſtand the phraſe in this ſenſe; *God created*, i. e. *cauſed to exiſt*. *But in what manner*, or *from what matter or ſubſtance, he formed this his creation, is impoſſible for us to tell.*" *Forming* ſuppoſes that to be præ-exiſtent, which is formed; but *creation*, when we are told, the form is not intended to be ſpoke of, can mean no leſs than *cauſing it to exiſt*; it not exiſting before in any ſenſe. *Forming a creation* is a confuſed jingle of words. And aſking of what *matter* or *ſubſtance* God *formed* the *creation*, is denying a creation, by taking it for granted it was a formation only of præ-exiſtent matter.

He allows it indeed in words, when he ſays *God gave a being to matter*, and I am ſenſible does not intentionally deny it; but then he deſtroys the evidence of Scripture for it; and gives us only his own *ſayſo*; for the Infidel will at once cloſe in, with his alternative, and ſay, *matter is co-eternal with God*, and identical too, as *Heſiod* does, in the places referred to above. But God's creating *the ſpirit itſelf*, that now creates the other creatures, and before it was *ſpirit*—his creating the materials, and that creating or giving them an animal or vegetable form, are expreſt by the ſame word, according to the conſtant cuſtom of Scripture; the one being to be underſtood by analogy from the other. The direct *how* God created, cannot be underſtood by us, at preſent however, if ever; but ſurely we know *when* and *where* he created. It was *here*, within the ſpace the world fills; and now 5772 years ago. "The true notion of creation is not a *forming* ſomething out of nothing, as out of a material cauſe." This he cites from Dr. Clarke; and I dont know who ever thought it was; but ſtill it is *producing ſomething out of nothing*; which expreſſes *negatively*, all and no more than the Dr. means by *bringing ſomething into being, which before had no being at all:* for *ſomething here* is ſpoken of, as having a being, before it had one. *Formation out of nothing* are Words without a Meaning, or which imply a Contradiction. 'The *Apoſtle* 'to the Hebrews ſeems to have been a ſtranger to 'the idea of Formation out of nothing.' And well he

he might. Heb. xi. 3. *thro' Faith we underſtand*, [i. e. it is a revealed Truth; we know it by Faith; not as a deduction of Reaſon, or what uninſtructed Reaſon could ever have thought of, or reaſoned about,] *that the Worlds were framed by the Word of God, ſo that things, which are ſeen*, μη εκ των φαινομενων γεγονεναι, were made of things that do not appear" Inſpired Writers themſelves muſt labour under a difficulty of deſcribing that in Words borrowed from ſenſible things, which is not the object of ſenſe, and Analogy only can help us out. God is not the object of Senſe, nor, but by analogy, the Subject of ou runderſtanding. *Creation*, like all Words for ſpiritual actions or things, is to be underſtood only by reſemblance. Our Verſion that —— *things which are ſeen were not made of things that do appear*, implys, tho' it doth not directly expreſs, what I apprehend is the true Senſe of the Greek, that *the things which are ſeen were made of things that do not appear*, becauſe *they were not made of things which do appear*. Will any man ſay, God created the World out of things that do appear? If he doth, he denys that God gave *Being* to matter. This is not what Mr. Dodd intentionally drives at, but his way of arguing leads directly to; and the creation of the World, notwithſtanding the formal account Moſes gives of the origin of things, will be a *neſcio quid*, a non credo. That Chriſtian Heroine 2 Macc. vii. 2, 8, bids her ſon look upon the Heaven and the Earth, and all that is therein, and conſider that God

made them ουκ εξ οντων of *things that were not*; and ſo was mankind made likewiſe;" expreſſing herſelf negatively, as we do when we ſay, God made the World out of *no-thing*. The Apoſtles μη εκ φαινομενων is exactly parallel to her ουκ εξ οντων; and as he oppoſeth τα βλεπομενα to the μη φαινομενα, ſo ſhe oppoſeth the ſame things *we look upon*, to ουκ οντα *the no-thing* or *nothings*, God made all things of. And if the ſubtlety of the metaphyſician thinks it can drive thoſe words to an abſurdity; it is from an abſurd conſtruction of them; they not meaning that God created things out of nothing, as *out of a material cauſe*, but *from* nothing; there being nothing to create them from, or make them of.

God Aleim or Elohim from Mr Locke.

——" *Elohim* ſignifies *Almighties*, or Almighty " Powers. The word is of the plural termi- " nation; but the Hebrew language often ex- " preſſes the ſuperlative degree by a word of " plural termination. [*no more than any other* " *language does*] It is owned that Elohim is of " ſo general a ſignification, as to denote ſome- " times the *Prophets*, the *Angels*; ſometimes " the Magiſtracy; ſometimes the Gods of the " Nations—."

Then the word does not ſignify *Almighties*; unleſs men and angels and the heathen Gods were ſo; and Mr. Locke contradicts himſelf.

" To infer more divine perſons from the word *Elohim*, ſays *Calvin*, is a ſtrained gloſs: which

which does not prove the Trinity, but rather introduces Sabellianiſm."

Had *Calvin* been a prophet, and one of Mr. Locke's *Almighties*, his *ſay ſo* would have been of ſome authority to him; or had Mr. Locke been one of them, his *ſay ſo* would have been of ſome ſervice to our Author, in what he aims at. In the mean time this is only the meer ipſe dixit of one man, ſupported by that of another. Doth not ſaying that *there are three, that bear record in heaven*, tend as much to Sabellianiſm, as calling God our *allies* in the Chriſtian Warfare, *Judges*, *Creators*, and the like, which occur often. Is not *three* a plural word, as well as *Elohim?* and many others applied to God in the old Teſtament? *Let us make man in our image*, is liable to the ſame charge; are not *us* and *our* plural?

" *Elohim* is of ſingular ſignification, 1 Sam. xxviii. 13, 14. I ſaw *Elohim*. What form is *he* of? *an old man* cometh up. Such is Mr. Locke's note."

The Woman ſaw Samuel v. 12, and 13. She ſaw *Elohim* coming up with him, out of the earth. Balaam, who was as wicked as this Woman, ſaw *the viſion* of *the Almighty*. And if the Woman ſaw *Elohim* with Samuel, as ſhe ſays, why muſt the word be of ſingular ſignification here? Why *Locke* ſays it; and we are to tell noſes for the truth. *When the Woman ſaw Samuel, ſhe cried with a loud voice*; that ſhe ſaw him, to be ſure, and ſeeing a viſion of God with him, was what occaſioned the outcry; which

which it is likely ſhe as little expected, as to ſee any thing like Samuel. Saul aſks after the form of the Man ſhe took for Samuel, or Samuel was repreſented in, and not after that of the Elohim. and Mr. Locke's Criticiſm on the word is, as good as his inſtance from the text to prove it of ſingular ſignification; groundleſs all; *ſuch is Mr. Locke's note*, ſuppoſing it his. "Who to this paſſage in Samuel might have added, Pſal. xlv. 6. compared with Heb. i. 8. for proof." Says our Author.

But if *Elohim* there be *the heavens*, who were the *Gods* of the Heathens, and are often ſpoke of, under that title in Scripture, and in Heb. 1. under that of *Angels* or *Agents*, as they are of God, and commiſſioned to act for our uſe, and *the Son*, ſpoke of, be the humanity of our Lord, then this argument alſo fails againſt the ſo well known plurality of the word. And it muſt be the *Human Nature*, that is ſpoken of, by what follows, --- *God even thy God hath anointed thee with the oyl of gladneſs above thy fellows*. The Man Chriſt Jeſus is exalted above the Gods, the heavens, the agents of our God, tho' Gods to the Heathen world, and is ſet down, *at the right hand of the Majeſty on high*, all power in heaven and earth being put into his hands, and ſo the heaven is his throne, or his throne is in heaven; 'tis not Ω θεος *O God*; but Ο θεος *the God* or Elohim; and the ſame ſpoke of Pſal. xcvii. 7. "Worſhip him, all ye Gods," in which the throne was to be ſet; and worded here as Prov. ix. 14. כסא מרמי a ſeat in the high places,

places, without a prepoſition in the Hebrew. But, " The doctrine of the Trinity by no means wants the ſupport of the word *Elohim*; if it did, it would ſurely ſtand on a tottering foundation."

If ſuch aſſertions as that from Mr. Locke, of the meaning of the word, which hath not a ſhadow of proof belonging to it; and ſuch proofs of its ſingular ſignification as the above can affect it, it would indeed totter of itſelf. But when the Author conſiders the many plural verbs, nouns, pronouns and adjectives uſed with it, its plural ſignification will totter, only in a froward and conceited imagination. If capital points of doctrine are not to be proved from the Word of God, his names, titles and attributes in Scripture, what are they to be proved from. But this from the meaning of the Hebrew name is *new*; i. e. it is new to the objectors, tho' as old as Adam; for all mankind have always underſtood *Judges*, *holy ones*, and the like, to mean more than one; and when he can prove all language and grammar to be uncertain, and that the parts of ſpeech, number, gender and ſo forth, are not to be aſcertained, I will give up, not only the argument from this word, but from all others. I paſs on to the word *Heaven*, See under v. 1.

The heaven---" There is nothing plainer from verſe the eighth, than that the heaven here meant, is that firmament or expanſion, *that region of air*, with its furniture of Sun, Moon, Stars,

Stars, &c. which is the object of our immediate ſight and attention."

Then we are allowed, without being liable to the charge of following a vain philoſophy, to place *Sun, Moon, Stars, &c.* within the region of the air; and they are allowed to have been created with our earth, and at the ſame time, viz. *in the beginning of time.* But in the next words this is retracted --- *Very poſſibly the whole planetary ſyſtem might be created at the ſame time with this earth of ours.* Why very *poſſibly?* Doth not Moſes, according to his own conſtruction of the words, poſſitively aſſert it? Is it only poſſibly true then? He allows that *heaven* means the region of air, with its furniture of *Sun, Moon, Stars, &c.* and by his wording of himſelf, one would imagine, he thought the *whole planetary ſyſtem* compriſed more than *Sun, Moon, Stars, &c.* or that the Stars were within the region of the air, but not the Planets. Some have ſuppoſed, ſays he, that the word *Heaven* compriſes the *whole planetary* ſyſtem at leaſt; *but it appears to me to have been the deſign of Moſes to give us only an account of that, which immediately concerns us, namely, of the origin of the Earth, which we inhabit, and of that expanſion, which is around us, and whoſe ſhining furniture ſo ſtrongly evinces the hand of its Creator*; then that *ſhining* furniture *includes Sun, Moon, Stars, &c.* but not the *whole planetary ſyſtem*, according to his philoſophy. Moſes begins with telling us, that God created the Heaven and the Earth, i. e. the Earth

Earth with the expanſion around it, and its ſhining furniture of Sun, Moon, Stars, &c. but this comprehends not the whole planetary ſyſtem, for of that, Moſes intended not to give us an account; or ſay any thing of its origin. But if *the Sun, Moon, Stars, &c.* (tho' I ſhould be glad to know what *the &c.* ſtands for here,) are within the region of air, and are part of its ſhining furniture, the origin of which, Moſes does, it is allowed, give an account of, then that account extends to the whole planetary ſyſtem; unleſs the Planets are beyond the *Stars, &c.* and the Author appears plainly neither to have known what was Moſes's deſign, nor what was his own; nor, I may add, the meaning either of what Moſes ſays, or of what he ſays himſelf. Here we have a diſtinction alſo betwixt *the region of air*, and *that expanſion, which is around us*, but under v. 6. by *the firmament I would underſtand all that immenſe ſpace, which every way ſurrounds our Earth, and extends to the limits of our ſyſtem*, which muſt include its ſhining furniture of *Sun, Moon, Stars, &c.* as he allows before; and the region of air, with the Stars in it, are the ſame with *that expanſion, which is around us*, out of which he excludes the planetary ſyſtem; but which, one would think, muſt be included in *Sun, Moon, Stars, &c.* But of them more anon.

The Earth was without form and void. He allows this to mean that the Earth was not yet *formed into order and beauty*; but diſtinguiſhes not the particular meaning of תהו and בהו. In Iſaiah

Iſaiah xxxiv. 11. they are rendered, he obſerves, *confuſion* and *emptineſs*; but whether rightly or no, he ſays not; *confuſion* or *without form*, if that be the meaning of תהו, as by the compariſon here in Iſaiah, it plainly is, deſcribes a ſtate of deſolation, where every thing is deſtroyed; that one thing can't be diſtinguiſhed from another; not, *things* laying in confuſion, or thrown into a heap together irregularly, but the things themſelves ruined, and their diſtinct forms deſtroyed, as when a city is burnt, every thing is reduced to aſhes. And *ſtones of emptineſs*, or *hollow ruins*, when hollow is applied to the earth, makes it *hollow* or *empty* within; a globe with a cavity within ſide, and called *empty*, as we call a caſk empty when there is nothing but air in it. He does not object to the ſenſe of *void* or *empty*; only that our Tranſlation renders בהו in one place, as תהו alſo, by a ſubſtantive, in another by an adjective. The idea or meaning of בהו, as given by our Tranſlation, whether as a ſubſtantive, *emptineſs*, or an *adjective*, *void* or *empty*, is the ſame, but he doth not care to apply it to the earth, either as noun or adjective. *And it is to be wiſhed that our Commentator had rendered the word either by one ſubſtantive, or by one adjective*, and conſidered and explained what was meant by the earth being *empty*, *void*, or *emptineſs*; and not have left his unlearned reader to have collected it for himſelf, from his confuſed jumble of the two words into one general deſolation; *they* ſc. the two words, תהו and בהו, *deſcribe*, he ſays, *the total*

total deſolation, which ſhould overwhelm the Country, and reduce it, as it were, *to that ſtate in which the earth was, before it was formed.* And what *that ſtate* was, is the very thing the Commentator was to have given us ſome notions of, from the *preciſe* meaning of the two Words in this paſſage of Iſaiah, but that would have ſpoiled a good deal that follows, and been contrary to the art of commenting.

Darkneſs— *on the face of the deep.* "Every "thing was yet in a black and unform-"ed ſtate, [why *black* more than *white* I "can't ſee; nor what a *black ſtate means*] "and the whole face of the deep or vaſt "abyſs of primordial matter, was enveloped "in total darkneſs; an abſolute privation of "all light." Here we are at a loſs again to know what *enveloping* a *black ſtate* of *things with an abſolute privation* means. *Black* indeed is as applicable to the *ſtate* or *condition* of things, as *enveloping* is to a *privation.* A Coat made of nothing, is not a very good one; and enveloping with a negative quantity, not very good ſenſe. And is *darkneſs* nothing, an *abſolute* privation of light only? A meer abſence? Beſides the nonſenſe it fathers on the Prophet here, it gives him the point blank lye, which ſomewhere I have read, is the higheſt point of offence, and in Exod. x. 21, where he tells us, there was *darkneſs to be felt*; is as palpable a falſehood, as this is nonſenſe, if *darkneſs* be not ſomething as really a ſubſtance, as light or any thing elſe, that may be felt, is.

Iſai. ch. xlv. 7. I "form the light and *create the darkneſs*," are the words of the Creator himſelf. And did he create nothing, an abſolute privation only, when he created the darkneſs? This by much the greateſt part of created matter, he hath ſent back into his primitive nothing, and deprived the light and ſpirit of their ſubſtratum, and the Heavens of their ſubſtance. Job aſks, ch. xxxviii. 19, "which is the way to the dwelling place of light, or where is the place of darkneſs?" This ſurely though ſeemingly referred to for that purpoſe, doth not prove that darkneſs has no place to be in, and ſo is nothing itſelf. The Scriptures as well as the antient profane Writers tell us it is *ſtorkend air*; ignis item denſum ſpiſſatus in æra tranſit, ſays the Latin Poet and Heſiod, Theog. lin. 124. Νυκτος δ' αυτ' Αιθηρ τε καὶ Ημερη εξεγενοντο Job xviii. 6. *the light ſhall be dark* in his Tabernacle; Iſai. v. 30. "The light is darkned in the Heavens thereof;" xiii. 10. "The Sun, (the ſolar light) ſhall be darkned in his going forth; xlii. 6. I will make darkneſs light before them;" Joel iii. 4, "the Sun ſhall be turned into darkneſs;" that light and darkneſs are reciprocally changeable into each other, and that both are only air in other forms, was the opinion of the old Philoſophers in general; as may be ſeen by numbers of quotations in Mr. H--n's Moſes's Principia, p. 198, pt. 2, though he is an Author ſo obnoxious to their concealed Arians, Socinians, and Deiſts in Chriſtian orders, that

it

it is offenſive to even but mention his name, unleſs to ſet a falſe mark upon it. But ſhould not our Commentator, before he had diſcarded ſo great a part of matter out of the Creation, have conſidered ſome of thoſe many texts, and other authorities, that ſpeak of it as a ſubſtance, and convertible into light, and of that light, as being again ſtorken'd into darkneſs? That Fire will not ſubſiſt without Air is what every child knows; and ſo the Air muſt reach the Sun and Stars, and be coextended with light, wherever that travels to; and what a quantity of matter muſt that be, which fills all the ſpace betwixt the Sun and the Stars, which the ſolid orbs do not; and beyond the Stars remains yet in a ſphere of matter, in its primitive ſtorkend condition; the depth of which is unknown to us; its uſe very viſible and certain. This *darkneſs* was upon the *face* of *Teum* the deep, the *unformed and hollow* Earth. How far it extended upward, and ſo how far what of it that remains ſtill in its dark or ſtorkened ſtate extends, Moſes tells us not; but other Scriptures tell us the Heavens are unſearchable, and their height paſt finding out. It would be a matter of meer curioſity only, of no real uſe to us, to know it; but as far as this fluid we call *Heaven* extends upwards from us, or rather from the Sun, ſo far *darkneſs* extended, and was not called *Heaven*, till the expanſion was raiſed in it, *God called* the *firmament Heaven*; and that *light* is part of this dry fluid, at firſt in a ſtate of darkneſs, and when the *ſpirit* and

 light

light were formed in it, called *Heaven*, appears from the part of S.S. alone; becauſe *light* and *ſpirit*, both, are and act upon the face of the deep firſt, where there was nothing but darkneſs before, and ſo Jer. iv. 23. I beheld the Earth and lo it was without form and void; and the Heavens and אין אורם they *had* no light; *lucis egens aer their light was not.* Light belonged to them, before the Sun was made; and now is no part at all of the orb of the Sun, any more than light and heat are of the fuel fire burns in; and ſo the light of the candle is toto cælo different from its tallow. *The Heavens without light*, in Jeremiah, is equivalent to *darkneſs*, in Geneſis. Both ſay the Earth was without form and void, and the one, that the Heavens were without light over it, and the other, that *darkneſs* was upon it. Thus plainly do Moſes and the Prophets tell us, that at the creation of the Heavens and the Earth, the Earth was a formleſs moſs, and the whole Heavens without light, in a ſtate of darkneſs, from their higheſt ſummit down to the Earth. And this is the ſituation and condition of things at the firſt implied in the command of *letting light be*, after their creation; and the ſubſequent account of the formation of the deep into the preſent terraqueous Globe and the ſeveral *forms* that exiſt within and without it.

The making *da kneſs* a privation only, a nonentity, is a moſt egregious blunder, and envelops a commentator in a cloud, with reſpect to all that follows; and ours is ſo far loſt, as not

to

to be able to diſcern the Spirit, that is Jehovah from the ſpirit, that is air, in the next words. He miſtakes the Breath of Heaven, for God the Spirit.

And the Spirit of God—" for my own part I can hardly conceive that *wind*, or *air in motion* is meant here."—

The material Spirit that now *creates* Animals and Vegetables, and continually *renews the face of the Earth*, it is moſt natural to think, was that plaſtic power, which by the immediate direction of the hand of God, gave it its firſt face. The Pſalmiſt, Pſal. civ, 30, it is plain, ſpeaks of the Agent that carries on vegetation, " thou ſendeſt forth *thy Spirit*, they are " created : and thou reneweſt the face of the " Earth." Will this Commentator ſay, it is the holy Spirit, that carries on vegetation and animal life? The word רוח ſtands for many things in SS. for God *the Spirit*, the ſpirit of Man ; for the breath or ſpirit of heaven, and for any common or particular wind. And the words רוח אלהים though applicable by themſelves to the uncreated, or the created Spirit, do yet ſpeak plainly, *in their ſituation*, Gen. i. 2, to the Naturaliſt, that they mean only that ſpirit, which *renews* the face of the earth ; and new forms or grows plants and animals. If there is a material ſpirit, which with the help of light and water, does this *now*, whether *that* is the ſpirit ſpoken of, which gave the earth its firſt face or no, will admit of little diſpute. Moſes by calling it *God*'s *Spirit*, ſuppoſing he means the material ſpirit, does by the expreſſion, ſuf-

ficiently declare it had its commiſſion now, immediately from God, or was conſtituted by God himſelf, and not by any ſecondary cauſe; and that it was not in power before. Or, if this were not clear from the words and circumſtances here, it is from other parts of Scripture, Gen. viii. 1. "God made רוח *a wind* to paſs over the earth, and the waters were aſſuaged." It is the ſame רוח *ſpirit*, that aſſuaged the waters at firſt, and ſo he allows himſelf, at Ch. viii. 1. forgetting what he ſays here; and this is the ſame agent, which God commanded the water by, Exod. xv. 10. "Thou didſt blow with thy רוח *wind* or ſpirit, the ſea covered them;" and here is called *God's Spirit*, as much as it is Gen. i. 1. and that for the ſame reaſon, becauſe, God made it to blow, by his own immediate power. Job xxvi. 13. "By *his Spirit*, he garniſhed the heavens." xxvii. 3. "The Spirit of God is in my noſtrils." Pſal. cxlvii. 18. "He cauſeth *his wind* to blow, and the waters flow." Iſai. xl. 7. "The graſs withereth, the flower fadeth, becauſe the *Spirit* of *Jehovah* bloweth upon it." Is this ſpoke of the Spirit, who is Jehovah, or of the material Spirit? Does he ſpeak like a Chriſtian, or Philoſopher, who ſays it muſt either be

"The Holy Spirit---or a divine and plaſtic power, an emanation of the Divinity, deriving its firſt and all-pervading motion into the chaotic maſs."

Is not this confounding God with his creatures, and making him the *anima mundi?* degrading him into a periſhable fluid? as he confounds

founds the Son alſo with the *νους* or *mind* of the antient Philoſophers, who were without God, in the world, worſhipping the creature, in the next paragraph. Ezek. xxxvii. 9. Shews plainly what plaſtic power it is, which ſupports animal life. "Say to הרוח *the wind*, come from the four winds, הרוח O *Breath*, and breath upon theſe ſlain, that they may live." This is God's creature, and not the Creator. Am. iv. 13. He that formeth the mountains, and createth the *wind*, marg. *Spirit*---the Lord, the God of Hoſts, is his name; Virgil's *tum pater omnipotens fæcundis imbribus æther, &c.* is as ſound Divinity, and much ſounder Philoſophy, than our Chriſtian Commentator's. But it can't be the ſpirit of heaven, Gen. i. 2.

"Becauſe *the air* being a part of the material creation, was contained, as I apprehend, in that unformed maſs, called by *the general name* of heaven and earth, and conſequently was not yet ſeparated, nor, as it appears, till the ſecond day, when God made the firmament or expanſion."

Was there ever a more unfortunate blunder, or a more abſurd one, than to take *heaven* and *earth* for *one general name?* and imagine that God created an *olla podrida* of heaven and earth, firmament and air, fire and water, ſtars and muſhrooms, and *an &c.* all laying in a confuſed jumble together? They were endued, he tells us, with their natural powers, but being covered over with an abſolute privation of light, they lay all as it were entranced, till a plaſtic

emanation upon---or a *tremulous undulating* motion upon the ſurface of the water, rouſed the *fiery* particles; and they emerged, and begun a dance around the earth; and then mounted up into the ſky, and ſqueezed and compreſſed themſelves into ſolid lights, as will more fully appear, under the next head or two of enquiry. But before I diſmiſs this, let me aſk what authority he has to ſuppoſe, that the ſpirit did pervade the chaotic maſs. The text only ſays it *moved upon the ſurface of the water*; why then does he ſay, *it derived its all-pervading motion into* the midſt of it. Is an external ſuperficial motion an internal all-pervading one? This is all the Commentator's imagination; not only unſupported by, but directly contrary to the text he is commenting upon; as well as to his own conſtruction of the word *moved*, which immediately follows.

Moved---" ſeems properly to ſignify to make a *tremulous* or *fluttering motion*, ſuch as that of an Eagle *fluttering* over her neſt; in which ſenſe it is uſed Deut. xxxii. 11. *fluttereth over her young*. This, and not the idea of a bird *brooding* over her eggs, appears to be the exact meaning of the word."

And may I not aſk what is the *exact* meaning of *fluttering over her young*, but *brooding over them*, to warm and cheriſh them with heat from her own body; which is all in a tremble during her ſitting upon the eggs, or brooding over the young; and hot and dry Deut. xxxii. 11. Is but obſcurely tranſlated in our verſion, tho'

tho' better than the LXX; but the Vulgate is a ſtrange wide paraphraſe, *as an Eagle provoking his young one's to fly, and fluttering over them ſtretches out his wings; and took him and carried on his ſhoulders.* Than which nothing hardly is wider from the ſenſe of the Hebrew, and truth of the caſe. The LXX. *as an Eagle covers her neſt, and broods over her young; letting down her wings, receives them, and takes them upon her back.* I am not quite far North enough to have had an opportunity to obſerve an Eagle when ſhe firſt takes her young from the neſt, to teach them to fly; but little birds take them between their legs, and hold them by the feathers of the neck, with their bill. They are extremely ſhy, when they come forth loaded with their tender charge, but I have ſeen them with their burthen. A Hen broods over her chickens, as the LXX deſcribes the Eagle, and the young chicken play about the Hen, and jump up upon the dam, and often get upon her back, as ſhe ſits; but it is hardly poſſible a young Eagle ſhould fix itſelf upon the back of the old one, as ſhe flies. יעיר Which we render *ſtirreth up* and the LXX σκεπασαι *covers* or *ſits upon* her neſt is *hatching* the neſt of eggs; well enough expreſt in the Greek; becauſe *covering* or ſitting upon the neſt, implies what ſhe covers it for; the Hebrew word is uſed for *raiſing* a plant from a ſeed. What we meant by *ſtirring up her neſt*, I really can't ſay; no doubt it was intelligible then; I would render the verſe, *as an Eagle hatcheth her neſt*, ſc. of eggs, *broods over*

her young; ſpreads out her wings; takes them and carries them, by their feathers.—So the Lord alone did lead or conduct Iſrael; hatched them when they were, as it were, in the egg, in Egypt, their neſt; brooded over them with tender care, and brought them out of their neſt, and taught them to fly with the ſtrength of an Eagle. What an Eagle does, I can't ſay; but the notion of carrying the Eaglet upon her back, and fluttering over it, to teach it to fly, I imagine came from the LXX and Vulgate, who conſtrued from the Hen's brooding her chicken, not from the care of an Eagle over her young from the egg till it can fly, which is the compariſon in the prophet. So *the ſpirit* ſat upon the Chaos, hatched the earth, and carries it by its wings; the earth flies upon the wings of the ſpirit; but the preciſe ſenſe of רחף is brooding with a tremulous motion; and this is the meaning of the word in the other only place it occurs in, Jer. xxiii. 9. " My heart is broken within me, all my bones *ſhake*." רחפו כל עצמתי All my body, or all parts of my body *are in a tremble*. This *fluttering* or *quivering* motion is the *brooding* over an egg, the antients likened the motion of the ſpirit upon the waters to. The ſpirit does not itſelf pervade the water, but by its preſſure, drives in the heat, which can. " Chaos and darkneſs, according to the Heathens, were in the beginning: *Love* or a plaſtic ſpirit *brooded* over this Chaos, as over an egg, ſays Mr. Dodd, with a deſign to credit or diſcredit his own interpretation? which? If they thought wrong in

in thinking ſo, why does he cite it, to ſhew they borrowed ſo much of their Theogony from Moſes? and if they thought it right, and it is a proof that they did borrow ſo much of their Theogony from him, what was he thinking of when he cited it, againſt his own interpretation? The illuſtration from an egg is ſo beautiful, that one would have been tempted to have ſtrained the text to ſupport it, had there been occaſion. Let the Reader turn to Moſes's Prin. p. 1. and he will ſoon be convinced how little Mr. Dodd underſtood of what he pretends to explain to us.

Let there be light and there was light.

Unbelievers have triumphed, it ſeems, upon this, that there was light before the ſun was. And is not the anſwer obvious, that every farthing candle gives light, and that often, where the ſun never comes. It does ſo in my poor garret which never ſaw the ſun yet. Two flints will ſtrike a light, &c. &c. which we are not beholding to the ſun for.

" The objection ſeems to be founded on a groſs miſconception, that *light* is nothing more than an emanation from the ſun.

True, but what then is light? of what formed, and how ſubſiſting? He ſays,

" In the new Jeruſalem, Rev. xxi. 23. there is neither Sun nor Moon, yet there is no night nor darkneſs there." Nor material light neither, for the *glory of God* did lighten it; and what have theſe texts to do with the objection? He refers to Exod. xiii. 21. " *Where we have*

an

an account of light ſupported by the power of God without a luminary." And in the ſame manner the firſt light was; there was ſpirit and darkneſs, a cloud for it to ſubſiſt in. God by his immediate power kept the cloud together, and the fire when kindled in it, would burn on, till the cloud was diſperſed; as it does in our common fuel, till that is diſperſed.

" God, the light of the world."——

Of what world? for God's ſake. Not of this world ſurely! The created light is not God. Tho' he ſuppoſes the heathen God and ours to be the ſame, yet he will not make Jehovah to be the light of this world, I hope.

"——Muſt either ſuſtain the light in the firſt act of creation, [ang, *when firſt made*] by his own immediate power," no, not *immediately*; but by his agent the ſpirit. Light can live upon ſpirit; and darkneſs ſupply the waſte of the ſpirit;——*Titaniaque aſtra, ſpiritus intus alit. igni enim pabulum eſt ſpiritus.* God ſupported the ſpirit, becauſe there was nothing as yet to ſupport it. God, no doubt can give light, without the aid of any ſecondary cauſe; but when he ſaid, *let there be light*, he ſpoke to ſomething, capable, in his hands, of forming it; and that light muſt be formed of ſome præ-exiſtent matter, and be ſome how ſupported, till the ſun was made; which our Author is endeavouring to give an account of, " Or rather, that in conſequence of that original motion, *impreſſed* on the chaotic maſs [*above, it is an all-pervading motion*] thoſe particles of matter we call *fire*, whoſe

whoſe known properties are *light* and *heat*, being the lighteſt, ſtrongeſt and moſt active of the elements, diſuniting themſelves, aſcended and conſtituted that light, which on the fourth day."—He was to have told us how it ſubſiſted before the fourth day, before the ſun was; inſtead of that, here is a blind ſtory of the fiery particles diſuniting themſelves, and getting up into the ſky, but not one word, how they kept together, when they were there. Theſe fiery particles are diſperſed in a moment, in the open ſky now, if they chance to get together. He leaves the objection to the triumph of unbelievers *in ſtatu quo*, and proceeds to tell us how it is ſuſtained ſince the fourth day; or how the luminaries were formed; and that in a manner new and ſurprizing, viz.

" The particles of fire diſuniting themſelves aſcended, and conſtituted that *light*, which, in the fourth day, was *compreſſed* and *conſolidated*, if I may ſo ſpeak [*aye, aye, why not talk nonſenſe here, as well as in ſo many other places*] into the body of the ſun, and other luminaries."

And this by a natural power inherent in the elements;—" It ſeems evident that after the firſt *viviſying motion*, impreſſed by the ſpirit of God, the material atoms or elements, were left in a meaſure to their *natural* and regular operation, under the direction of the Supreme Creator."

The fire then being by that motion waked out of its ſleep, by a natural activity, at one bound overleapt all bound, and got clear of the Chaos; and then by its own *natural operation com-*

compreſſed and conſolidated itſelf into the body of the ſun, and other luminaries. The frogs are in danger, for if the fire naturally tends to *a conſolidation* into luminaries, why may it not multiply ſuns and other luminaries, as the ſame *igneus vigor* does plants? Stars and Planets may multiply, as naturally as weeds do, according to this Philoſophy. He goes on, *e Cathedrâ*,

" For you obſerve *light* firſt appears, as conſiſting of the ſubtileſt matter, next *the air* or firmament, next the waters, and ſo the earth."

No Sir, you obſerve *darkneſs* appears firſt; then the ſpirit, then the face of the water; then the light; without any regard to their natural lightneſs, ſtrength or activity and the Author is talking quite without book.

" And the matter of all the elements being united together in the firſt *confuſed* Chaos."--

Where does he learn all this? The text tells him no ſuch thing; neither ſays a word, nor gives a hint about it. It only ſays, the earth was *without form.* The materials, things were to be formed of, might lie in the utmoſt regularity, notwithſtanding that; our Author ſeems to be talking after Ovid, thro' his whole account, with ſcarce half an eye to his text. Is it not more becoming the wiſdom and foreſight of the Creator, to ſuppoſe the many materials the world was to be built of, to be depoſited orderly and regularly, and where they would be wanted? Had blind chance created the world, the confuſion he dreams of might have been ſuppoſed, without offence to common

ſenſe.

ſenſe. But he can't get *Ovid* out of his head. Tho' there are many particulars conſonant to the S. S. and truth in *Ovid*, which he had picked up either from LXX, or by tradition, or both; yet he plays the Poet, as well as the Philoſopher, and has mixed much traſh with the traditionary truth. — " Is there any difficulty in imagining, that the fiery and luminous particles firſt ſprang forth, and with their brightneſs irradiated the earth?"

Why yes, or elſe what is all this long ſection for, in anſwer to the Infidel, how triumphantly demands, how there could be light to irradiate the earth three days before the ſun was made? and now at length he is anſwered by aſking the queſtion, if there be any difficulty in conceiving it. For my own part, I can no more imagine that the fiery and luminous particles ſhould ſpring forth from the Chaos, by any natural operation of their own, and continue three days irradiating the earth, and then make themſelves wings and fly away, and at laſt ſettle into luminaries, than I can, how the movements of a watch ſhould make themſelves, ſettle their proper powers, ſhew us the hour of the day, as they lay ſcattered upon the table, and then put themſelves together into a regular machine. A piece of mechaniſm may as well be ſuppoſed to perform, without being put together; or be ſuppoſed to have a *natural* and *regular operation* in its ſeveral parts, as this can be ſuppoſed of the Elements themſelves.

" But

" But after all, I may ſay with Le Clerc, that it is unneceſſary, to philoſophize too ſubtily concerning the cauſe and nature of this light."

If the above be philoſophizing, I agree, the leſs of it the better, and he is ſafe from the charge of too much ſubtlety.

I have paſſed by the birth place of the ſtars, and muſt lead the Reader back a note or two, to,

" *Face of the waters*, v. 2. Which Mr. Dodd allows, is the ſame with the face of *the deep*, the abyſs juſt mentioned, the *terraqueous* unformed maſs."

This was what the ſpirit moved upon the ſurface of; and we learn hence, that this *vivifying*, *fluttering*, *tremulous*, *undulating* motive *emanation* from Mr. Dodd's Divinity, hatched them without brooding upon it, only ſuperficially penetrating into it, the whole neſt of the luminaries of heaven; for if the ſpirit moved upon the face of the waters, and on that, the fiery particles, with their properties of light and heat at their heels *ſprang forth*,

[ignea convexi vis, et ſine pondere, cœli emicuit] and then compreſſed and conſolidated themſelves, into the body of the ſun, and other luminaries; they muſt, before this vivifying undulation at the ſurface of the waters, be under that ſurface, and ſo within the *terraqueous* globe. The ſun is by us Aſtronomers reckoned a pretty deal bigger than the earth, which, to ſay nothing of the Moon, Stars, &c. being once lodged within the ſurface of this *terraqueous* globe, will enable us to ſettle the great diſpute about the

Bottle-

Bottle-conjurer in the Hay-market, whether he would have been able to have performed his promiſe or no. Tho' ſome doubted, ſo many others were amazed to think how he would perform it, that they flocked in ſuch numbers to ſee the experiment, that a tumult aroſe, and the bottle was broke, before the conjurer had an opportunity to break it himſelf, and the matter remains yet a problem with many. Some have offered to demonſtrate the impoſſibility of it. The body of a man, five foot high, cannot be contained in a quart bottle, there not being ſo many cubic inches in the bottle as in the man by a hundred and forty four dozen; therefore the thing *containing* being ſo much leſs than the thing *contained*, it was impoſſible. But they that argue ſo, are miſtaken, the thing *contained* may be many millions of times bigger than the thing *containing*, as we ſee is proved here. And I refer my Reader for farther proof that the ſtars were in the earth, to *Ovid*,

Cum, quæ preſſa diu maſſâ latuere ſub illâ
Sidera, cæperunt toto effervеſcere cœlo. Lib. 1. fab. 2. l. 70. and Heſiod, Theog. lin. 126.

Γαια δε τοι πρωτον εγεινατο ισην εαυτη
Ουρανον αςεροενθ'.

I have cited theſe paſſages, not from a ſpirit of envy, to rob our Commentator of the honor of the diſcovery, but to confirm it, for the ſake of the conſequence.

The formation of light we have conſidered. Next,

Divided,

Divided, " Mr. Locke by a ſhort remark on this place, ſhews that he approved Le Clerc's verſion, --- God divided *time* by light and darkneſs."

The text ſays, God divided בין *between* the light and *between* the darkneſs; *i. e.* between day and night. And if Le Clerc thought, as it is here ſaid, and Locke approved it, it is evident neither one nor the other could conſtrue as plain a text as any from Geneſis to Malachi.

Don't let our author cry out here, and pertly tell me, you are a paltry fellow, juſt crept out of your garret, and Locke was the great Mr. Locke, whom ſuch a creature as you are not to diſpute with. I have heard many a Chit argue ſo, and expect a greater deference paid to them, with a Locke or Newton in their mouth, than thoſe great men themſelves either expected or received. It is well known that בין doth not ſignify *by*, and Le Clerc's is a falſe verſion. and he expoſes the great Mr. Locke in making him patroniſe ſuch ſtuff as he does.

God called the *light day*, &c. " That is, he cauſed them to be ſo called afterwards, amongſt men." Note, v. 5.

That is, he did not call them ſo. And thus the text and comment agree, as uſual. Had Moſes meant that men called them ſo *afterwards*, he had no occaſion to ſay any thing about it, becauſe his own calling them ſo, had been a proof ſufficient that they were called ſo.

The

The evening and the morning --- "On this [the firſt] day, as on all others, the night preceeded the day: the Hebrews reckoned their days from evening to evening ---."

The Hebrews begun their day, in the morning. So the Paſſover was to be kept on the fourteenth day, *at even*; at *the going down* of the ſun; and yet it is ſaid Exod. xii. 51. "It came to paſs *the ſelf ſame day*, the Lord did bring the children of Iſrael out of Egypt," i. e. in the night of the fourteenth day, at the evening of which, they had kept the Paſſover. They did indeed keep their faſts *from even to even*; and begin to celebrate their feſtivals, from the evening preceeding them; but their *day* began in the morning. And ſo Matth. xxviii. 1. *in the end of the ſabbath, as it began to dawn towards the firſt day of the week.* The ſabbath therefore did not end till the morning of the firſt day of the week, and then that firſt day begun.

"The *evening* expreſſes the night, the *morning* day," ſays Mr. Dodd. But where, or with whom, do they expreſs ſo? This is a groundleſs aſſertion, a confounding of words, as different in their meaning as *day* and *night*; and were never, that I know of, confounded before, by any writer. And it is as unſupported with any proof, as the laſt, about the time of beginning the day. The text does not ſay, *the evening and the morning were the firſt day*; but *it was evening*, or, it *became evening, and it became morning*; *the firſt day*. i. e. One artificial day was paſt. *It*

became evening, implies that the natural day was paſt. And, *it became morning*, implies that the night was paſt; and is a very juſt way of ſpeaking, if they began their day in the morning, as they did. The vulgar phraſe was, *it turned day*, or *turned evening*, and יהי ערב *it became evening*, is as proper. No one doubts that a night paſt betwixt the evening and the morning, mentioned at the end of the firſt day; nor that a natural day paſt betwixt that morning and the next evening, mentioned as part of the ſecond day. v. 8. *And it was evening and it was morning; a ſecond day.* And if ſaying the ſecond day evening was come, implies that a natural day was paſt; why ſhould not *the firſt day evening being come*, imply the ſame? But where did *it become evening*; what part of the earth is referred to? Moſes mentions none, nor which moved, the light or the earth; one muſt, to make evening and morning; but Moſes tells us not which, nor was there any occaſion; for the earth would as naturally turn, when it felt the heat, as a ſmoak jack, when the heat comes to it; or which is a more ſimilar caſe, as a ſmall globe will, around a large copper one electriſed. And we have there the evidence of our own eyes, that the earth is turned round in like manner. We ſee the agent, and the manner of its operation. And the light muſt act in the ſame manner, whilſt in the hand of the divine Workman, as afterwards, when the fire was kindled in the ſun, to ſupport it mechanically. There was evening and there was morn-

morning afterwards, juſt as before, during the three firſt days; all went regularly on, in the ſame manner. No other alteration being made, than in the manner the light was ſupplied. And it was evening and morning to the ſame parts of the earth, and at the ſame reſpective times, it would have been, if the ſun had, as ſince, riſen and ſet, upon the earth. In what ever part of its orbit, the earth was at firſt placed, whether in Libra, i. e. at the Autumnal Equinox, which ſeems out of doubt, becauſe the Year of the World begins there, in S. S. as ſoon as the light aroſe upon it, one Hemiſphere only would be enlightened, but its motion would enſue, upon its being enlightened; and day and night would commence. And a conſtant change, or *exchange between* them, would continue, purſuing each other in a conſtant round, as long as the light laſted. And it was evening and morning then upon the earth, where ever it is now at the Autumnal Equinox. Should it be aſked which was firſt, light or darkneſs, we are told that *darkneſs* was; how long, is not ſaid. If it be aſked which was firſt, *night* or *day?* the queſtion is juſt the ſame, as aſking which part of the Globe of the Earth firſt moved. It is always *day*, ſomewhere. It is always *night*, ſomewhere. Always morning, and always evening. If the ſun is riſing here, it is ſetting 180 degrees from me; ſhould it be aſked, which part of the earth the ante-ſolar light ſhone forth upon the firſt day; That is only aſking at what time of the year, the

earth was made, the ſun not altering, only continuing the courſe, the primæval light had begun.

The ſixth verſe, it ſeems, contains an account of *the generation of air*, which like the fire was once all under water in the deep. The fire indeed ſuppreſt its fiery nature, and compreſſed itſelf into luminaries. The air getting looſe with a load of water at its back, expanded, and filled all the ſpace betwixt the earth and the higheſt regions. And from its expanding itſelf was named *elaſtic*; and from its load of water *above it*, *at its lower end*, named *heaven*, i. e. *water there*, N. B. *above* in the ſeventh verſe, means *below*; me judice. But let us hear the Philoſopher himſelf, in his own words; leſt I ſhould be charged with doing by him what he does by the text.

" This air, in its firſt created ſtate, was intermingled with the other elements, in the chaotic maſs; upon which, a motion having been impreſſed by the divine energy, and the light having emerged; the Almighty next directs the air, according to its nature, to operate amidſt the waters, and, by its expanſive and compreſſive power, to carry ſome of theſe waters aloft with it;"—no higher than the clouds, [tho' for v. 7.] *afterwards to diſtill in uſeful and ſalutary rain.* The generation of the air ſeems to be forgot, unleſs implied, in the direction to act according to its nature. And the waters above the heavens, are, we ſee, the ſame as thoſe in the clouds, at this lower end of the air; and

and Pere Houbigant, or Dr. Kennicott ſhould have been called in to have amended the text.

But what ſays Moſes, why that *God ſaid* יהי רקיע *let the firmament be in the midſt of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.* Speaking of it, as ſomething in being, and now directed to perform, or juſt now grown to a ſtrength ſufficient to perform the command; not as when light was made, *let there be light and there was light*; but *let it be in ſuch a place and there act.* And the ſcene of its action is the abyſs, our terraqueous Globe, it was *here* to divide waters from waters; not one word or hint about carrying them aloft. ver. 6, ſays, *let the firmament divide between the waters*; make a partition or diviſion between them. A man divides a room into two, by running a partition acroſs, or a pond by a wall or bank thro' it; does he carry one part away? The ſeventh verſe ſays, that *God divided between the waters that were under, and between the waters that were above the firmament.* The waters therefore were *under the air*, and *above air* both before they were divided; ſo far was that diviſion from giving them their places of *above* and *below.* And this of carrying waters aloft, is all entire imagination, utterly groundleſs; and though he is pleaſed to ſay that,

" Not only the words but the nature of things correſpond," yet neither the words, nor the nature of things have the leaſt correſpondence with it. To ſtand ſeriouſly with a grave face, to confute the notion of a chaotic Maſs,

with Sun, Moon, Stars and Air, &c. intermixed, and the water overflowing them, would be a hard taſk; however Ovid is not a ſufficient authority for it. Indeed the account doth not hang very well together; though what I thought at the firſt coup d'oeil to be a main difficulty in the way, that the thing containing ought to be at leaſt as big as the thing contained, is got over, the fact, that the waters on our Earth, did once envelop all the Heavenly bodies, and the very heavens themſelves, being again confirmed here, for the *light having emerged*, the air, which had not yet emerged, is directed to act in the midſt of the waters; it therefore was there; under the waters; and at its emerging, was to carry ſome of theſe waters *aloft with it*. It augments the difficulty indeed to find the whole body of Heaven, which *fills* ſuch an immenſe ſpace, crammed in with ſo much company into ſo ſmall a Veſſel as the Earth, without ſo much as a Cabin within ſide.

That *the expanſion* was in being, when God ſaid, *let it be in the water*, the form of the expreſſion ſhews; and air was not *now* generated; nor is the *air alone* the expanſion or *Heaven*. We are told that the expanſion and Heaven are the ſame. And *Heaven* includes *the ſpirit* and *light*, that were made the firſt day; and by the ſecond, were increaſed in ſtrength enough to be ſet to work, the great work of forming the Earth, and the things of it; *the face of which they continually renew*. And it is to their joint action, or to them, *jointly in action*, that the words רקיע

and

and שמים are given as names, and the title of שמים is given to the ether or ethers, as they are *an expanſion*, and not for raiſing water, or having water in them. God called *the firmament*, or *the expanſive powers* of Heaven, quatenus ſuch by that name of *Heaven:* i. e. God made that which expands to become שמים; whatever the word ſignifies. To be *called* by a name, is to be what the name implies. *He ſhall be called the Lord our righteouſneſs*, is, he ſhall be the Lord our righteouſneſs. *They ſhall call his name Emmanuel.* Καλειϑαι *aliquis dicitur Hebræis, nomine quo numquam appellatus eſt, ſed quod ſtatum ejus pulchre exprimit.* And our Author need not have blundered ſo at ver. 5. nor is there any difficulty in conceiving what is meant by *calling the expanſion* by the name of *Heaven*, שמים; ſince it is as an expanſion, it is ſo called: Its expanſive power entitles it to the title; by that power it formed the Earth, and ſtill rules over it. But he that will be blind, let him be ſo.

" Thoſe who underſtand the nature of the air, which is peculiarly *elaſtic*, and therefore *expanſive* and *compreſſing*, will ſee the great propriety of the original, *rechio*, which is derived from the verb *recho*, to *ſtretch forth*, *&c.*"

It is ſo. But air without light, or the finer ether, that can paſs the pores of glaſs, would have no more elaſticity in it, than it has wiſdom. *Elaſticity*, till the cauſe and manner of it be explained, is not a philoſophical term, only an occult quality. If any one think I

wrong it and his philoſophy, let him prove that the finer ether is not as neceſſary to the *expanſion* of Heaven, as the groſſer called air. Or prove that air can or doth expand. *Air* hath no union or adheſion of its parts as ſteel has, that its make may render it elaſtic. Nor can two grains of air, when drove cloſer together in the air pump or otherwiſe, than they like have an antipathy againſt each other *naturally*, ſo as immediately to ſeparate from each other, get off as it were in a pet, to a proper diſtance, as ſoon as they are at liberty, unleſs they had both eyes and legs, or what is equivalent. If this Gentleman thinks otherwiſe, let him give us ſome tolerable account how *matter* can move itſelf; by what means the air comes to be elaſtic; how its parts can ſpring from one another, or ſwell out and dilate, without ſomething coming between. But he ſees it perhaps he will ſay, and refer me to the air pump. He ſees it is dilated or expanded, but by *what*, he doth not ſee; or that it dilates itſelf, he doth not ſee. That light or heat, the properties of fire, as he calls them, will *expand* with air is certain; take an half blown bladder, and lay it before a fire, and that air in it will gradually *be expanded*, till it burſt the bladder. And if he can prove as plainly, that air will expand, where there is none of the finer ether, I ſhall truckle under. *The whole ſpace we ſee, and commonly call heaven, is nothing more than the air*, he ſays; what then, let me aſk him, becomes of that quantity of heat and light,

light, which continually flows from the ſun, and other fires? Is it nothing in itſelf? or is it annihilated, when it has done its buſineſs?

" *Heaven* is nothing more then *the air:* which how far it may riſe and extend, I take not upon me to conjecture. But it ſeems moſt probable, [and I have Sir Iſaac Newton's authority, or at leaſt ſuppoſition on my ſide,] that the whole planetary ſpace is filled with a fine and ſubtle ether; which, it may be conjectured, grows finer and finer, as it approaches the central fire of the ſun; and becomes groſſer and groſſer, the nearer it approaches the center of our planet; and [perhaps of others,] ſo groſs as *almoſt* to be felt and ſeen."

If it is not *quite* felt, what is it we feel, when the wind blows, or when the air is agitated by the hand, or a projectile, or where the air draws into a fire?

" By the firmament therefore, I would underſtand all that immenſe ſpace to the limits of our ſyſtem; and which I conceive to be filled with air, or ether, denſer or finer, in proportion to its proximity to, or diſtance from the ſun."

And he has Sir Iſaac Newton's authority, at leaſt ſuppoſition, for this, he ſays. Sir Iſaac, in his Optics Edit. 1706. p. 309. thinks it altogether neceſſary, that *ſpatia cæleſtia omni materiâ ſint vacua*, for any ether there would diſturb the Planets and Comets in their walks, and ſtop up their road; his authority therefore, as to the queſtion whether the heavens be full, is nothing

ing. Where he contradicts himſelf, he may be ſaid to be dodging indeed; and *he ſuppoſes*, Mr. Dodd ſays, that the heavens are full of air, but refers to no paſſage. Sir Iſaac Optics, 1719. p. 350. ſays, *an non jam calor ille trans vacuum defertur vibrationibus medii cujuſdam, longe quam eſt aer ſubtilioris.* And in the next page, *an non hoc medium multo rarius eſt intra corpora denſa ſolis, ſtellarum, planetarum et cometarum quam in vacuis ſpatiis cæleſtibus interjectis? annon denſius perpetuo denſiuſque evadit*, &c. So much in the ſtile Mr. Dodd ſpeaks of his *air* in, that I ſuppoſe this is the *ſuppoſition* of Sir Iſaac's, he means, but has miſtaken the ſenſe; plain as the words are, as to the *medium* or *ether* he was talking about; for as to a medium becoming denſer, and denſer, in *empty ſpaces*, it is a little confuſed; *full empty ſpaces* ſounds odd; but Mr. Dodd miſtakes what Sir Iſaac was talking of, he being talking of a medium, *far more ſubtle and finer than* air, and which can paſs the pores of glaſs, without interruption from the glaſs; and even the denſe bodies of Sun, Moon, and Stars. Now if there is ſuch a *medium* or *ether* as this, extended thro' all nature, and in our Atmoſphere, intermixed with the air, or if Mr. Dodd's *air* be of two kinds, denſer and rarer, the nearer or further it is from the fire, is not the rarer part of it *heaven*, or *expanſion*, as much as the denſer? Muſt not the denſer expand into the rarer, and that of courſe enter in among the denſer; and expand it, with all the force the denſer itſelf is moved with? as

we

we ſee it does, from its burſting a bladder, to its burſting a rock, or tearing a diamond to pieces? But then what are we to do here? for this is all *rank hutchinſonianiſm*, that very *vain philoſophy* of Mr. Hutchinſon's, he exhorts us in his *conference*, to drop as a noſtrum, that troubles the conſcience of all good Chriſtians, that are of no party; Latitudinarians, and fitteſt to judge of the truth. But here he is faln into it unawares; ſwallows the *ſuppoſition* from Sir Iſaac Newton, who tells the ſtory but very awkwardly, and left it without any proof; but its own native evidence, ſtanding in contradiction to his own authority, and oppoſed by an whole army of mathematical principles. In Sir Iſaac, it is good philoſophy, how diſadvantageouſly ſoever expoſed to view; in Mr. Hutchinſon, nothing but *vanity*; tho' backed with authorities from Scripture, all the antient writers on the ſubject; explained at large, and proved from experiments, and the moſt common and unconteſted obſervations. Mr. Jones has ſet this philoſophy in ſuch a light, and ſo demonſtrably proved it, that I may venture to refer any one to him for full ſatisfaction on this head, who has eyes to ſee. Either Mr. Dodd is playing booty here, being an Hutchinſonian in his heart, or was, in his *conference*, *ſpeaking evil* of *things he underſtood not*; but it is certain, that the above, is the very Hutchinſonian philoſophy, he pretended ſuch an antipathy to; and there is ſo cloſe a connection betwixt that philoſophy and divinity, that I am afraid he will

ſpoil

ſpoil his fortune, by giving his friends room to ſuſpect him of being a ſecret favourer of it.

We come now to v. 9. *Let the waters be gathered together into one place.* This undoubtedly, ſuppoſes they were in two or more places before. Our Commentator underſtands the text, to ſpeak of the *lower water*, which *prevailed over the face* of the earth, and *covered the chaotic maſs*. See note ch. 7. v. 11. what *two places* was this water in? It covered the whole face of the earth, and ſo was one general ſea, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe,

Omnia pontus erant. It had but one bottom, or bed it lay in. Mr. Locke ſaw the abſurdity of making the preſent ſeas *one place*, when the ſea that covered the whole earth muſt be deemed to have been two or more; for if the ſeveral ſeas or diviſions of waters, ſcattered over the face of the earth, be all *one place*, ſurely the whole muſt be *one*, when the waters uninterruptedly covered that face; and therefore he conſtrues the *one* place to mean many. A hard ſhift! but what could we do? "Unto *one place*. i. e. Says Mr. Locke, *into their reſpective places*—but Calmet's note is the moſt judicious; *all the waters of the world have one general communication.*" And they had not one general communication before, where there was nothing to interrupt that communication? Can they be ſaid to be in one place now, more than they were then? Neither Mr. Calmet, nor our Author, ſeem at leaſt to have thought about the two places, the waters muſt be in, before they were

were gathered into one. If the earth were *void* or hollow, as Moſes deſcribes it; and the waters of the flood iſſued forth from *the womb* of the earth, as God in Job deſcribes it; then that *void* or *womb* is *the one place*, thoſe on the ſurface of the earth were carried to; called *the decreed place*, God had prepared for them; where they joined with thoſe that lay on the inſide of the earth; and the ſhell of the earth muſt be the wall, that divided them before. The expanſion, or air in expanſion, within and without, the earth, formed this wall between them; and penetrating through it, burſt it; and ſo *brake up* the decreed place, and the air came up, and the waters were gathered together into one general reſervoir; and with this all the ſeas do communicate. Our Comentator denies all this I know, but then he muſt diſprove it; which he will be able to do, when he can defend his own notions; and that in juſtice to his Bookſeller and purchaſers, he is bound to do, if he can. The Heathens had a tradition of this form and make of the earth, as appears from Heſiod, beſides thoſe many authorities, produced by others to this purpoſe.

Ταρταρα τ' ηεροεντα μυχω χθονος ευρυοδειης Theog. l. 119. Let me refer to an excellent piece of Mr. Catcott's, on the Deluge, and the Reader will be convinced, it muſt be ignorance of the ſubject, that hath produced theſe ſhallow jejune notes, on that part of Scripture now before us, in Mr. Dodd's Commentary; for upon the generation of light, and the ſtars, we ſee the

vaſtneſs

vaſtneſs of his imagination, and the fire of a truly poetical genius.

But the waters cover the whole face of the earth; and we muſt get them off again, if we can, but not in the Hutchinſonian way, for the univerſal world.

"——How the channels were hallowed, the rocks and mountains formed, &c. is not perhaps eaſy, or poſſible for us to determine; tho' upon the principles of gravitation, *it* ſeems not difficult to be reſolved."

It is not eaſy, or perhaps poſſible to determine the meaning of this ſentence. If it is not eaſy, nor poſſible to determine, *how* the mountains were made, can it be eaſy to *reſolve it* upon any principles? I can't determine *how*, but I can reſolve *the how*; or account for it, upon the principles of gravitation! But we will gueſs the meaning to be, that tho' we don't know *who*, or *what* made a mountain, or formed the earth within and without, that yet it is formed according to the principles of gravitation. And I would aſk, what *gravitation* is, whether a *cauſe* or *effect*. If a cauſe, whether the firſt cauſe, or a ſecondary one. If the firſt cauſe, why he diſtinguiſhes it from the divine power? If only a ſecondary one, whether it is different from the *expanſion?* If it be, what it is? and why the expanſion, which at v. 6. carried ſome waters aloft, and kept others in their *due ſtation below*, could not go thro' the work, but muſt do things by halves? at Gen. viii. 1. Moſes aſcribes the aſſwaging of the waters, and their

their going off the Earth to *the ſpirit*; *God made a wind to paſs, and the waters were aſſwaged*; why then as a Commentator on Moſes, does he lay aſide the expanſion, before he had confuted the Prophet, and proved it could not perform the work he ſets it about? Moſes excludes the *immediate power* of God, or *omnipotent energy*, when he makes God ſay, *let the waters be gathered together*, and ſpoke to the *natural cauſes*, onſy ſuperintending them, and they act mechanically, however overruled and conducted each operation is by the Divine Power. If by *gravitation*, he means that *je ne ſçais quoi*, Sir Iſaac talks ſo much of in his *principia*, and profeſſes over and over again, that he did not know what it was; whether it was behind or before us, drove or only enticed us along: and at laſt entirely laid it aſide, and ſubſtituted the ether in its room, if this be what he intends by *gravitation*, will he be ſo good as to prove its exiſtence? and then tell us, what its principles are, and where we are to find them. But if this be only the language of the Philoſopher and *reſolving the making of the mountains, and hollowing out the channels upon the principles of gravitation*, mean only that the waters naturally ſunk away by their own weight, and the rocks and mountains were ſaved from ſinking by their weight, and the channels were hallowed out, by the weight of the waters upon them, or ſunk by their own weight, or ſomething of this nature; then it will lie upon him to ſhew

how

how the waters could ſink by their gravity into the Earth, *when the earthy particles, being the heavieſt, would naturally ſink to the center; and the watery, in conſequence, would occupy the ſuperficies of the maſs:* Could they, upon *the principles of gravity*, turn the tables upon *the earthy* particles, get under them, and hollow out channels for themſelves? And when as yet there was no declivity to help them? Nor could *the ſpirit*, or *wind*, *help* them, upon the principles of gravitation, becauſe the earthy particles, being heavieſt, muſt, upon thoſe principles, neceſſarily lay undermoſt; nay, join the Almighty arm to their hand, upon thoſe principles, it would ſtill be the ſame; the *earthy* muſt ſtill lay undermoſt, and having got poſſeſſion of the center of the maſs, the *watery* could only occupy the outſide. Beſides, it is a little hard upon them to require them to begin to ſink, when they lay upon the ſuperficies of the maſs, and the earthy particles occupied all the inſide down to the center, and there was not ſo much as a mouſe hole for them to creep in at; for where ſhould they ſink to? Here is no room for them to retire to; make one for themſelves they cannot; for it is contrary to their principles; and the only friend they had, acts upon the ſame principles, that tied up their own hands. I may conclude then, it was as impoſſible to remove the waters off the ſurface of the chaotic maſs, whoſe center up to that ſurface was filled with heavier particles, upon the principles of gravitation, as by thoſe principles to have fetched

fetched them out of their primitive nothing. Mr. Dodd is doubly inconſiſtent, when he calls in *the divine energy* to hollow out the channels, becauſe as a Commentator on the *Holy* Bible, he is obliged to ſuppoſe it true, and that tells him God יעבר רוח, and that then the waters ſtopt, and afterwards ſunk away, and conſequently, then the channels were hollowed out, and mountains formed; ſo that the *paſſing along* of *this wind or ſpirit*, is what Moſes aſcribes thoſe great effects, and many, many others to. And this, as a Commentator, he was to have opened, for the benefit of the unlearned, and dreſſed out, in a manner, that it ſhould not be beneath the attention of the learned. Whether the diſpoſition of the ſtrata of the Earth, and of the exuviæ lodged in them, be ſubjected to the principles of gravitation, as well as the face of the Earth, by this learned Gentleman, I don't know; becauſe I dont know the extent of the &c. [*mountains formed &c.*] but a ſhell may as well grow by gravity, in a block of ſtone, or creep up to the top of a mountain, as that mountain or rock to the top of the Earth, by gravity.

There is a confuſion in many Writers, about the ſeveral periods of the deluge of its beginning, abating and ending, as well as about the manner, and the agents concerned. Gen. vii. 4. "I will cauſe it to rain upon the Earth forty days, and forty nights: and every living ſubſtance that I have made, will I deſtroy from off the face of the Earth;" therefore within thoſe forty

days, the tops of the higheſt mountains muſt be covered; or the living things might, and doubtleſs would, have taken ſhelter there; v. 11. "The ſame day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up: and ארבת השמים, *the air-cracks* were opened." Now what fountains hath the Sea? The land hath fountains or paſſages from the ſea, for water; what was *broken up* muſt be land. And this was not, in Mr. Dodd's language, *a rupture of the Ocean*, but of the paſſages in the land; *the deep* was not ruptured, but thoſe larger cracks or fiſſures, by which it communicated with the land, were ruptured, and ſuch fountains muſt lie deeper than the ſea, or they were broken up, to no purpoſe to come at the ſea; whoſe top afforded a much ſhorter and eaſier acceſs to its water. And if there are paſſages below the bottom of the ſea, by which water is conveyed up to the ſurface of the Earth, then there is a *great deep*; becauſe its fountains were broken up; and every coal-pit is a proof that there are ſuch paſſages; Queenborough, in the Iſle of Sheppy, was ſome years ago greatly diſtreſt for want of good water; and boring down to find a ſpring, after they had ſunk their well to a very conſiderable depth, the water, and that exceeding good, burſt up ſo faſt, as even to endanger the lives of thoſe who were boring at the bottom of the well; and upon meaſuring the depth, they had bored to, they found they had gone beyond the level of the bottom of the ſea. And if there are alſo *air-cracks*, through which air paſſes up and down

down, open to the eye, to the greateſt depths we can go, and the air, in paſſing them, is both ſeen, and heard, and felt, then ארבת השמים which literally ſignifies *air-cracks*, may be allowed to have been opened, without tranſubſtantiating air into water, as Mr. Dodd does, by making theſe *air-cracks* to be *water-cracks*, or cracks in the clouds. *The fountains were broken up, and the air-cracks widened.* And then v. 12, "The rain was upon the earth." That which broke up the fountains and widen'd the air-cracks in the earth, acted by the immediate power of God, as much as it did at the creation, but contrary to its ordinary courſe, and what was *that?* Why, the ordinary agent, the expanſion, or air expanding; it went down, driven by the divine hand, and forced up the waters through the fountains, in ſuch an extraordinary quantity, that they could not hold it, and ſo burſt; and at the ſame time widen'd the cracks of their own paſſage into the water below, by being driven in with greater force, and in greater quantity than uſual, and raiſed the water up into the air, in a proportionable quantity. And this continued forty days and nights; during which time, the water aroſe fifteen cubits above the higheſt mountains. If a cubit be the length of the arm from the cubit or elbow downwards, it would be about a foot and a half, and fifteen cubits would make two and twenty feet and a half. And ſo high the waters were got above the mountains, during the forty days, v. 17, 20.

" *The flood was forty days*," [juſt, as long as the rain was] *upon the earth:* and the waters increaſed, and bare up the Ark; and the waters prevailed, and were increaſed greatly upon the earth, and all the high hills, that were under the whole heaven, were covered; fifteen cubits upwards, did the waters prevail." And all this, during the firſt forty days; and then the fountains and the air-cracks were cloſed up; and the waters continued to their height, for a hundred and ten days longer; prevailing over the earth, for 150 days in the whole, and then they began to abate. v. 24. " The waters prevailed upon the earth, an hundred and forty days." Ch. viii. 1. God made the wind to paſs over the earth, and the waters were aſſwaged. [ישבו *ſtopt*, pitch'd down, and aroſe no higher.] And the fountains of the deep, *and the air-cracks*, were ſtopped, and the rain from heaven were reſtrained,--after the end of the hundred and fifty days, the waters were abated. " This is the plain ſtate of the duration of the flood, till its waters began to return. Had there been any deeper channels open, could the waters have ſtood triumphing over the tops of the mountains, for a hundred and ten days; the uncontroleable principles of gravitation, all the while diſputing their victory with them? And had there been no fountains, opened for the waters afterwards, and air-cracks for the air, that each might return to their proper homes, how could the waters have removed? Moſes mentions the opening of none,

none, but what is implied in *the paſſing of the wind over the earth*; that therefore muſt be there, where theſe cracks were opened; and the water, that went down, muſt change place with it; and ſo there was a place, not without on the ſurface, but within the earth, where the waters are now depoſited, and where the air was, during the firſt hundred and fifty days; or *an hundred and ten days*, from the cloſing up of the cracks, till the waters began to ſink away. But here was no declivity of the earth, which I think, I may ſay, Mr. Dodd dreams of, to help their deſcent; but a variety of inlets, into the womb of the earth; in hurrying to which, they tore the face of the earth into its preſent form. And let any man take a view of the country, from any of our hills, and his eyes will convince him, that it was not the immediate power of God, but the falls of water, ſea-ward, that harrowed the earth, into that beautiful, and uſeful variety of hills, vallies, and plains. If the fountains of the great deep, were all cloſed at the end of forty days, as is plain, [becauſe, as before cited, Gen. vii. 17–19, *the flood was forty days upon the earth—and all the high hills, that were under the whole heaven, were covered*; but the waters were not abated, till after the end of an hundred and fifty days,] there were no channels then hollowed; or place for the waters to retire to: and fall they could not, till there was a place for them to fall into, which our Author is ſo puzzled to make for them, not liking that, which Moſes aſſigned them; "Some

conceive, he ſays, that immenſe ſtores of water, are lodged in the bowels, [*Job, ſays in the womb*] of the earth; which are called the great deep: but as we have ſhewn in a former note, that all the congregated waters, called by the general name *ſeas*, communicate, it ſeems beſt to underſtand by *deep*, this vaſt collection. See Pſal. xxiv. 2. and cxxxvi. 6."

The 24th Pſalm ſays, *he hath founded it upon the ſeas; and eſtabliſhed it upon the floods.* The other, *to him that ſtretched out the earth above the waters.* In what ſenſe, can a baſin be ſaid to be ſtretched out above the water it holds in it? Is the earth founded upon the ſeas, or the ſeas upon it? What proportion does the depth of the ſeas bear to the diameter of the earth? the center of which muſt be deemed the ſtation, with reſpect to up and down; and the whole ſurface, or whatever is between that and the center, to be above it. *Since every thing tends towards the center of the earth, we are to conceive that point as being the loweſt, and not to carry our idea of downwards any further: thoſe that are diametrically oppoſite to us, being as much upon the upper part of the earth, as we are; there being no ſuch thing in nature, as one place being higher than another, but as it is at a greater diſtance from the center of the earth, let it be in what country ſoever*; ſays an Author, who knew here what he was talking about. So that theſe two texts alone overturn his whole ſcheme. I would not willingly ſuppoſe him ſo bad a Geometrician, as to think he could imagine there

was

was any declivity for the waters to run down, when the earth was reduced to the ſtate it was in, at its creation. And yet he ſays, " Had the rain ended at forty days end, the waters could not have prevailed an hundred and fifty days, by reaſon of *the declivity* of *the earth*." Note Gen. viii. 24.

What declivity had the ſurface of a ſphere, for the waters that covered the whole ſurface, to run down? Little maſter pouring ſome tea upon the top of his farthing ball, might talk of its running down the declivity; but to talk ſo with reſpect to the whole earth covered with water, is talking without thinking. Nor is it

" Hard to explain, how the waters encreaſed more and more, as it is ſaid ver. 17, 18, 19."

For they only ſuppoſe them to encreaſe more and more, during *the forty days*; and then the fountains were ſtopt, and the waters had neither declivity to run down, nor place to hold them, beſides what they occupied, that had a paſſage open to it. He goes on, after ſaying that if the rain had diſcontinued, the waters muſt have fal'n,

" And yet they were ſo far from falling, that the tops of the mountains were not ſeen, till the beginning of the tenth month, that is, till two hundred and ſeventy days were paſt."

The flood began *in the ſecond month, the ſeventeenth day of the month*; now deduct one month and ſeventeen days from nine months, and where will he find his *two hundred and ſeventy days?* I can find but two hundred and

twenty three, at thirty days to a month; which is our own reckoning; at nine months end, the tops of the mountains appeared. And he has *careleſly* overlooked the one month and ſeventeen days, elapſed, which are part of the nine months, before the tops were ſeen. I am ſorry to ſee it, but the Author learned as he conceits himſelf, and qualified to merit the attention of the learned, does not ſeem to underſtand even the common terms of art. Thus note in Gen. v. 5. ſome, he ſays, wholly deny the longevity of the Antediluvians, *inſiſting that not ſolar*, but *lunar years are meant*; *an abſurdity which carries its own conviction—They muſt have begotten children at the age of childhood themſelves.* Suppoſe then one of them had been a father, at thirty lunar years old; how many ſolar years would he have been old, does he ſuppoſe? There is not eleven days difference betwixt the ſolar and lunar year; and he that was thirty, by the ſhorteſt reckoning, muſt be above twenty-nine, by the longeſt. Here we have two glaring inſtances, one of his great diligence, the other of his ſuperior qualifications for the work he is about; and I have remarked them for his own ſake, that he may ſee he is not altogether the man he takes himſelf for; I could inſtance in others of of the like nature.

But to return, what are we preciſely to underſtand by יעבר אלהים רוח *God made a wind to paſs over the earth.* Or, *God made the ſpirit to paſs upon the earth.* The ſpirit is the ſame, that moved upon the face of the waters at firſt. And

it

it is not ſaid, that God made it move again, but made it *go on*, *go forward* again. It had not loſt its power, but its action had been ſuſpended here upon the earth. It is the firſt movement of the expanſion; ſtop that, and the whole muſt ſtand. Set that forward, or *going on* again, and the whole moves; עבר is to *paſs along*, continue a journey, keep on, go forward. God had ſuſpended the ordinary courſe of the expanſive power upon the earth; or elſe it could not be ſaid, that he ſet it forward again upon the earth. The conſequence of *ſetting forward* the ſpirit upon the earth, was the check put upon the riſing waters; they ſtopt; and the cloſing up the fountains of the deep, and the windows of heaven; and therefore *the windows of heaven* muſt mean ſomething in the earth, where the ſpirit, by going on again, cloſed *them* up, as well as the fountains. It is very odd language, that expreſſes the clouds pouring out their rain, by *making cracks in them*; and the ceaſing of the rain, by *ſtopping up the cracks of them*. And beſides, this is making the text ſay, what it does not; for, as I have obſerved before, it is *air-cracks*, not cloud-cracks, or water-cracks, that the words ſignify; for שמים is undoubtedly *air*, and not water, or clouds, and and ארבת ſimply *cracks*, or *creviſes*. But there are two texts referred to, that are ſuppoſed to ſpeak of the clouds, under the title of ארבת;

" ארבת, which properly ſignifying *openings*, *cracks*, or *fiſſures* of any kind, is uſed for the clouds of heaven; as will appear by referring

to

to 2 Kings vii. 19. and Mal. iii. 10." note v. 11.

The air went thro' thoſe cracks in the ſhell of the earth, into the water at the flood, in great quantity, and forced up the water of courſe. And the air goes down now, and vapours aſcend thro' them, and fall in rain, ſo that Mal. iii. 10. expreſſes a plenty, by deſcribing the cauſe of it; rain was withheld to puniſh them, for their ſins, by a ſcarcity; ſet thoſe cracks to work again, and rain would come, and a plenty enſue. And the unbelieving nobleman, may as well be ſuppoſed to think, that wheat and barley were to be found ready ground in the deep below, as in the clouds above; when indeed he meant neither; but that if the Lord would open the air-cracks, which are the windows of the houſe of the deep, and pour out corn directly, without the matter, that comes from thence, running the round of nature, then what the Prophet predicted might come to paſs, and plenty of corn be found next day, in the gates of Samaria. If rain does ariſe from the earth in vapours, then there are ſuch cracks, or fiſſures, as the text ſpeaks of, in the ground; and that the air can, and does paſs thro' thoſe cracks, and is the cauſe of the vapours riſing, is not to be denied. One of our moſt celebrated Philoſophers, cited by Mr. Dodd, ſays, *we may reaſonably conclude, that by opening the windows of heaven, is meant an extraordinary fall of water, not as rain, but in one great body*; but is miſtaken, if the opening of thoſe windows be the

cauſe

cauſe of the aſcent, and not of the deſcent of water; and this I leave to the further conſideration of any Philoſopher.

It is ſomething remarkable, what Moſes ſays, Gen. viii. 1. " That God remembered Noah, and every living thing, and all the cattle," that were with him in the Ark; and God made the wind to paſs on the earth, and the waters ſtopt, and the fountains, and air-cracks were cloſed up, and the rain ceaſed, " At the end of forty days." Why *remember Noah, and every living thing*, and therefore cloſe up the fountains and air-cracks, and put an end to the convulſions of nature? We know how many ſtrange effects, the riſing of vapours for rain, produces in the animal conſtitution, and may eaſily imagine, that thoſe diſorders, which Noah and his ſhipmates ſuffered under, muſt be very great, tho' experience only could tell us how great. The whole earth ſympathiſes with the Atmoſphere, when theſe invaders make an irruption upon it. See an account of the many terrors they raiſe in Dr. Woodward's third letter, Nat. Hiſt. Ill. what then muſt they undergo in the Ark, during ſuch a violent hurricane? as much it is likely as their ſtrength could bear; and therefore God remembered them, and put an end to it, the moment the high hills were covered with water, high enough to deſtroy the old earth, and make a new one with. And this was at the end of forty days. God remembered them, and put a ſtop to the hurricane; and the air became calm and ſerene, and they had an

hundred

hundred and ten days to breath in, as we ſay, and recover themſelves, before the hurricane ſhould begin again, on ſuch a vaſt body of waters, tumbling back again into the deep. And it was neceſſary that the Ark ſhould reſt, as it did, at the end of the hundred and fifty days, and not before; when the hurricane was renewed by the fall of the waters, and riſe of the air, into the Atmoſphere. It is eaſy to ſee elſe, that it muſt have been loſt in ſuch a tempeſt. At the end of forty days, the whole earth was drowned, and then as ſoon as poſſible, God remembered thoſe, whom he had a mind to ſave, but were ready to ſink under the diſorder, which the convulſions of nature produced. And at the end of an hundred and fifty days, the Ark was made to reſt, when it became abſolutely neceſſary it ſhould be fixed, and not before; the wiſdom of God doing nothing that is unneceſſary, and his goodneſs omitting nothing that is. I can't help bluſhing for Mr. Dodd, when I hear him aſſert that *ordinary continued rains of forty days and nights, would be found adequate to the effect* of deſtroying the earth and all fleſh. Good God! would Jehovah be introduced with that ſolemnity, *behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters*; and making bare his Almighty Arm, in overturning the foundations of the earth; and not only ſhaking, but pulling down the pillars of heaven, if an ordinary continued rain, any common cauſe, would have produced the effect? He adds, if you *take in the rupture of the great deep, and the union*

of

of its waters with thoſe from above. And is he really ſo ignorant of what rain is, as not to know it muſt come from below firſt, before it can be in the clouds, to fall in rain? And does he really think, that the waters, which the clouds now poured out ſo plentifully upon the earth, were the ſame that were lodged in them, at the creation? Upon what principles of gravitation could the air ſuſtain a body of water, capable of encloſing the whole earth, with a coat of near a mile thick? What ſhould hinder its falling in rain; or ſever it from the rain, that did fall, or prevent the vapours, that did riſe from mixing with it; or did it not rain before the flood? What ſtrange effects, muſt ſuch a body of water in the Atmoſphere produce in it and the earth? A miſt in winter ſhall ſo weaken the ſtrength of the ſun, that you may attentively view its face, and ſee its ſpots with your naked eyes. The cloud of a rain, that falls in a few hours, ſhall in a manner darken the ſun for the time; and what muſt a cloud of water, of but half a mile thick, over the whole earth, have done, begirting it with its baneful ſhade, for near ſixteen hundred years together? At ch. i. v. 7. the water carried aloft, at the firſt formation of the earth, was, he tells us, to diſtill *in uſeful and ſalutary rain*, here under ch. vii. v. 11. the clouds were plentifully ſtored with it; then, to be *ſent down again, to unite with the waters of the great deep*, to reduce the earth to its original chaotic *ſtate*. There it was *ſalutary rain*, here cataracts of deſtruction. I never met

met with an Author of a more unhappy memory. But let us emerge from under this weight of water, as faſt as we can, and get up to the ſtars, with our Author, who then is in his element.

We were at v. 9. ch. i. the place of the waters at firſt; which hath a natural connection with the place the waters came from, and returned to, at the flood. v. 11. and 12. Treat of the origin of the vegetable world. The Author makes a groundleſs diſtinction, agreable to his critical acumen, betwixt the words rendered *graſs* and *herbs*; and then point blank contradicts the plaineſt words poſſible of the text, in making *ſeeds*, before there were *plants*;

" The *ſeeds*, or firſt principles of all the vegetables, were formed moſt probably with the firſt chaotic atoms." *Note* v. 11. read Gen. ii. 5. " The Lord God made the earth, and the heavens, and every plant of the field, before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field, before it grew." And what were the ſeeds lodged in the Chaos for? for fear the plants ſhould not grow, belike

" Here, the *ſeeds*—we muſt believe, aroſe to, or rather *were created*, *in abſolute maturation* and perfection."

And a little lower,

" The ſeeds of plants, as well as of animals, contain the perfect draught in miniature, and all the parts and members of the mature and complete plant." Note v. 11.

So that the earth was at its creation, filled with num-

numberleſs little bodies, of the moſt exquiſite ſtructture, containing *each a whole plant in itſelf*; and yet note v. 2.

" In its firſt ſtate, the earth was a mere confuſed Chaos and maſs, *without any regular form*, or without any of its preſent furniture, plants, trees, animals, &c.

Now how it could be without that *furniture*, and yet ſo plentifully furniſhed with it, remains to be accounted for. Will he ſay, that *ſeeds* are not *plants*, tho' containing a whole plant in them; and ſo no part of the preſent furniture, he ſuppoſes the Chaos deſtitute of? Or will he ſay, that the earth being *unformed*, may admit of its being full of ſeeds, but not of plants and animals? I would not by any means charge him, with what I did not think he intended to ſay at the time; but by the earth being *without form*, he, it is plain did intend to ſay, that nothing was *formed in it*; and if a ſeed, which is of the moſt *exquiſite texture* imaginable, could be *created in abſolute maturation, with the firſt chaotic atoms*, and yet no *form* then exiſting, he may reconcile his two notes. But to take theſe two notes ſeparately, for it is impoſſible they ſhould agree together, any more than the text and his comments do in ſo many other inſtances, where does he find in the text the leaſt hint of *creating* ſeeds; or that ſeeds were coexiſtent with the Chaos? Doth not this lead ſtrongly to corroborate the infidel notion of the eternity of the world? If ſeeds were coeval with the atoms of the Chaos, then plants wanted

ed no immediate interpoſition of an external cauſe to make them; and the making of ſomething out of nothing, being an *idea*, *which at beſt is extremely dark and confuſed*, I may very logically get over the ſtumbling-block of a *creation*, being rid of the difficulty, how to get the earth ſtored with plants, and animals. Had theſe things dropt from the pen of a *Morgan*, or a *Middleton*, I confeſs, I ſhould without any ſcruple, have charged them with malice propenſe; but I acquit the Author of any direct ill deſign, and charge him only with writing without thinking, or attending to what he was commenting upon; a plot I don't ſuſpect him of. Talking nonſenſe, and running on in contradiction upon contradiction to himſelf, is only expoſing himſelf, and robbing his ſubſcriber or purchaſer, of their money, but teaching infidelity, and ſtrengthening the hand of Atheiſm, is a matter of quite another nature, whether there was any deſign in it or no. A ſeed *in abſolute maturation*, is no more, I ſuppoſe, than what a plain man would call *fully ripe*, and what was the Chaos ſtored with ſuch ſeeds for? By the principles of gravitation, they muſt ſink in the water, to ſpeak in the language of the learned, and be greatly pejorated by their abſolute ſaturation with watery particles, during the time of their immerſion. And when the water hurried away into the deep, it muſt carry moſt of them down with it, for food perhaps to the young fiſh; and of the reſt that remained, a great part muſt lay in the ground, till the

next ſpring, or the proper ſeaſon for each ſort, that eſcaped the wrack. And here will want Θεος απομηχανης, firſt to prevent their being waſhed off the earth, and next from rotting or ſprouting before their time, and ſo coming to nothing, which would be the caſe of ſeeds ſo ſoaked. And how he could find out *the wiſdom of God in this origin, and beginning of plants, by the means of this original proviſion of ſeed*, is not ſo clear; nor how he can reconcile this notion of his to the text, which ſo plainly tells us, that God himſelf made the plant; but the plant the ſeed. And yet after all this, he talks of the *fruit trees, &c. being produced in perfection*, but a few lines below. He ſays, *the ſeeds were formed with the firſt chaotic atoms*; the trees therefore were not produced in perfection, being according to him produced in ſeeds; God made all the tribes of the vegetable world, before they were in the ground; but not in their perfection, or at their full growth, one would think, becauſe they would not have been fit, or at leaſt not ſo fit for plants; which thrive beſt when younger. Nor did they *ſpring forth* by the immediate power of God, when planted, any more than they do now; for tho' there was no ſun, when God ſaid, *let the earth bring forth* דשא עשב the *green herb*, and the *tree*, [diſtinguiſhed by עשב and שיח ch. ii. 5. and Exod. ix. 25. by עשב and עץ; the one, bearing its ſeed in its greens; the other, in its fruit,] yet there was what was equivalent, the primæval light; and it was the ſame light, that was afterwards

ſupported in action, by the fire of the ſun. And the only difference in their production, now, from that at firſt, is, that at firſt, the plant produced the ſeed, and now the ſeed produces the plant; and that by the ſame natural means, the plant grew at firſt, after it was ſet by the Lord God himſelf. Revelation hath not *directly* informed us, at what ſeaſon of the year, the earth was made; but if the ſun ſhone firſt in the Meridian of Eden, at the Autumnal Equinox, the light had faithfully ſupplied its place, for three days before. And if it was autumn at Eden, it was ſpring on the other ſide of the Globe. All plants were not made in the country of Eden at firſt, that we know of; tho' man and the other animals were. Eden, no doubt was ſtored with a proper ſtock, for food and ſtore. And the *objection ariſing from differing ſeaſons* in *different climates*, may be removed, it is to be hoped, without rectifying the *obliquity of the ecliptic*, and rolling the earth upon its equator, before the flood; which the text is ſilent about, and they who preſume it, preſume it without any evidence. He adopts every baſtard almoſt of the imagination.

V. 14. *Let there be lights.* God had hitherto held in his own hand, the powers of the air, which rule over the earth, and *thruſt forth its precious things*, by their own bodily ſubſtance; but the wiſdom of providence admits not an immediate interpoſition, when nature can perform the work without. God therefore next kindles the fire of the ſun, to gene-

rate

rate and ſend out light; with proper *checks*, to return back into our ſphere, a ſufficient quantity of that, which otherwiſe would have been of no uſe to us. But the refined ſpirit of imagination, can't be reined in; it muſt find out other uſes for them, than the ſecretary of the divine Workman, tells us, they were made for. Some men magnify their diſtance, ſize and and number, out of the boundleſs ſtock of a fertile brain; and not knowing what the expanſion is, or conſidering with what, or whence the ſolar fire is ſupplied, or what the movements of nature are; conclude they are bodies, too glorious to be created, for our uſe only; *to give us a little dim light*, and ſo tacitly, openly indeed, impeach the Prophet of falſehood. Mr. Dodd, who is ſcarce half on Moſes's ſide, obſerves, on this text, that *two great bodies were to be formed as inſtruments of the diffuſal of light*; deſigning to exclude the others out of the account. But this text ſays not, how many were now formed for this purpoſe. God hath not told us, and man cannot. Our glaſſes are ſubject to the ſame deception, as the naked eye, nay more ſo, as to their number, from the *vehement ſparkling* of the ſtars; but they are all compriſed in the word מארת, *lights*; among theſe, two excell all the reſt, in that particular reſpect, and one the other.

" The wor dtranſlated *lights*, מארת, *Marth*, ſignifies *luminaries*, inſtruments of conveying and diffuſing light: and conſequently on this

interpretation, no objection can ariſe, from the moon's being an opaque body." Note v. 14.

But what is the word, Pſal. cxxxvi. 7. "To him that made great אורים *lights*, the Sun to rule by day; the Moon and the Stars to rule by night." Moſes calls them מארת a *luminary*; David אורים *lights*. Does his criticiſm upon *Marth*, take the ſtaff out of the hand of the Infidel, or put a ſword into it? *Tindal* might ſtill laugh; and tell the Author further, that this anſwer but ill becomes one, who makes Sun and Moon, and the other luminaries to be light *compreſſed and conſolidated*; "*The light was compreſſed, and conſolidated into the body of the ſun, and other luminaries.*" at v. 3. If the body of the ſun, and the other luminaries, be light compreſſed and conſolidated, then the moon according to his philoſophy, is no opaque body; nay, nor a bare *luminary*, but *light* itſelf. And one would think, by his way of ſpeaking, had more light in it, than it could naturally conſiſt of; and how does he anſwer the objection then, that the moon is an opaque body? If the light, its body conſiſts of, ſuffered ſo much indeed in the *compreſſure* and *conſolidation*, he has obliged the philoſophical world with the diſcovery of, ſo as to be quite extinguiſhed; he may ſave the credit of his anſwer ſo far, to the objection about the moon; but then the ſun muſt be as much an opaque body as the moon, for he compreſſes and conſolidates the light, into the body of both alike. And he has left us quite at a loſs, how the *vivifying motion* impreſſed at firſt,

was

was reſtored, after theſe fiery particles had been ſo crampt, by the operation of conſolidation; for they ſteal off in great plenty, from the ſun and moon, whether by connivance only, or by virtue of *their natural and regular operation*, which perhaps may *conſolidate* and *liquefy* them at pleaſure, as a key locks and unlocks a lock.

But not to refine too far upon ſo fine a piece of philoſophy, does he really think the moon to be as *luminous* as the ſun, or as a lamp, and to *hold* and diffuſe light, in the ſame manner? He couples all together, *inſtar lampadum ſint*. Is there no difference, no *material* difference betwixt the ſun and moon, with reſpect to the manner of their *holding* and *diffuſing* light? Can the moon be called a lamp, in the ſame ſenſe the ſun is? Does the fire burn in the moon, and emit the light, as it does in the ſun, and a lamp, or candle? Here is ſomething of too much conſequence, for a Commentator on this important part of Scripture, to have paſſed over in ſilence, had he known what he was babling about; and which his anſwer to the infidel objection abſolutely required. Moſes, ſays the Infidel, makes the ſun and moon both to be *lights*; no, ſays the Commentator, he only calls them *luminaries*, or *lamps*, which is the very thing the Infidel objects to; and inſiſts upon it, that the moon is not a *lamp*, and which our Champion in anſwering him, grants and denies in the ſame breath. But he knows not what light is, nor what darkneſs is, thickly as he is enveloped in it. This doughty objection being got ſo

handſomely over ſo far, we muſt get rid of the ſtars next; for ſome people tack them to the objection. But we need not admit it, for,

" It is evident from this, and the ſubſequent verſes, that Moſes confines himſelf *wholly* and *entirely* in this account, to what concerns our earth: So that one cannot help wondering to obſerve Commentators ſo apt to overlook this plain truth, and to make *wild excurſions*, to the formation of the whole planetary ſyſtem."

Why truly it is a ſad thing, that people will plunge out of their own depth, and drag other people after them. And I can't ſee how he will acquit Moſes himſelf, of making the wild excurſion; for he begins, as giving us the head of a chapter, *an account of the heavens and the earth*; and tells us, the ſtars are placed in the heavens, the ſame heavens, tho' a little further up in them, with thoſe the birds fly in the firmament of; ſo that we may expect an account of them too. No, it ſeems,

" Moſes confines himſelf *wholly* and *entirely* to what concerns our earth—only mentions [the ſtars,] briefly to ſhew that they were the workmanſhip of the ſame divine Creator; but does not farther enlarge upon them, as not belonging to his ſubject." Note v. 16.

And do not the ſtars concern our earth? hath not God *imparted them to all nations*, i. e. made them for their uſe and benefit? And does not Moſes in this chapter tell us ſo? v. 16. *God made two great lights—and the ſtars. And God ſet them in the firmament of heaven, to give light upon*

upon the earth, and to rule over the day, and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkneſs. So ſtand the words, detached from the parentheſis in the ſixteenth verſe, which only relate to the ſubordination of the moon to the ſun, and of the ſtars to the moon; the rule by day principally belonging to the ſun, and the rule by night to the moon and ſtars. Whatever imaginary difficulty there may be in the poſition of the words, in the 16th verſe; it is plain that the ſtars were made, when the ſun and moon were, to *rule in conjunction* with thoſe two greater lights. *God made two great lights—and the ſtars, and God ſet them.* What *them?* why, *the two great* lights *and the ſtars.* Where did he ſet *them?* in the firmament. To do what? why, to govern the earth; *to rule the day, and to rule the night.* How? by giving light upon the earth; and by dividing the day from the night, and the light from the darkneſs; and they do it conjointly. If this were not plain from hence, tho' words can hardly be plainer, ſee Pſal. cxxxvi. 7. "To him that made great lights, the ſun to rule by day; *the moon and the ſtars to rule by night.*" What then does the man mean by Moſes confining his account to our earth; and briefly mentioning the ſtars, but not further inlarging upon them, as not belonging to his ſubject? They belong as much to his ſubject, as ſun and moon do. And he hath enlarged as much upon them, and as fully explained their office. He tells us, *when* God made them; *where* he hath placed them; for

what end he made them; and *how* they anſwer that end; and alſo *what* enables them to anſwer it. Where now is our Author's ſuperior aſſiſtance, or greater abilities, than his brethren of the commenting genius have ſhewn? If he did not ſee that paſſage in the Pſalms, or compare verſes 16, 17, and 18 together, of the chapter immediately before him; or could not ſee from the 14th verſe, that *all* the lights of heaven are jointly concerned in the rule over the earth—where was that diligence he promiſed, and attention to the text itſelf? And if he did ſee the great truth, ſo plainly aſſerted in them, where is his ſincerity and fidelity? Would he purpoſely miſlead his reader, in a point of ſuch conſequence, as the uſe the ſtars were made for; a miſtake about which has given a handle to ſo much revery and infidelity? Moſes's words are very plain in themſelves. He diſtinguiſhes the ſuperiority of the ſun, above the moon, and next, of the moon above the ſtars, in the ſhare, each have in the dominion over the earth; and and twice expreſsly joins them all, in the regency; as the ſame ſpirit of wiſdom he wrote by, does in other places. But our Commentator on the Holy Bible, forgets it is *holy*; and will not let it ſpeak for itſelf. He is afraid, I ſuppoſe, of the Coffee-houſe jeſt; or what is equally a jeſt, the Newtonian authority, for their being ſuns to other ſyſtems; and therefore labours in chriſtian ſimplicity, to explain away the plain obvious meaning of the words; and talks backwards and forwards with the greateſt con-

confuſion, and inaccuracy of expreſſion. He remarks on a *ſtrange* abſurdity of the Authors of the Univerſal Hiſtory, who aſſert, that the ſun and moon were in full force from the beginning of the creation, and tells them,

" Nothing can be in more flat contradiction to the ſacred Text, which poſitively aſſerts, in the ſame terms, applied to the firſt formation of all other things, that on the fourth day, *God ſaid, let there be lights*; and that as he willed, he then made *two* great lights, the ſun and the moon—*to divide between the day and the night*, or to rule, &c."

And does not the ſacred Text as poſitively aſſert, that on the fourth day, *God ſaid, let there be lights*, and that as he willed, he then made *more than two great lights*, namely *ſun and moon and all the ſtars of light*. Pſal. cxxxvi, ix. *Great lights—the ſun to rule by day, the moon and the ſtars to rule by night*. And is it not as ſtrange an abſurdity in him to doubt whether they were now formed? to bring it in with a *perhaps* they were; and talk of *wild excurſions* into their formation?

Can any thing be a flatter contradiction to the ſacred Text, than excluding the ſtars from the regency; and making thoſe lights *two* only, the uſe of which is expreſſed? when God hath made a *multitude* of lights, which no man can number; all concerned in, and equally and ſolely made for the ſame uſe, of *dividing between day and night*, &c; As far I mean, as Scripture hath ſaid any thing about them; which aſſigns to them *this uſe*, and no other; and that

as

as much to them, as to ſun and moon. Moſes ſpoke of *all the ſtars of light*; all that ſhine in the firmament of Heaven, when he tells us, God *ſaid, let there be lights in the firmament of Heaven, to divide*, &c. All that ſhine to us are here comprehended. And of theſe he has ſpoken as fully as of the two greater ones themſelves. And he ſpeaks to the ſame Agent, *and in the ſame terms applied to the firſt formation of all other things*, when he ſaid, *let there be lights in the firmament of Heaven, to give light upon the Earth, and to rule it.* And if they were not made for the uſes, he ſays, they were made, where is his veracity? If they were made before, or for other purpoſes than he aſſigns, or follows by natural inferences from his words, *doth* not this Gentleman as flatly contradict the ſacred Text, as the *Univerſal Hiſtory*, which he complains of? Whether the ſtars are *glorious* or no, *i. e.* have any light in themſelves, or are meer blocks of matter, fitted only to reflect the light; and being fix't, to check the darkneſs behind, whether they are too good or not, to have no other employment than as ſecondary drudges in the government of the Earth, this is all the uſe, Moſes ſays, God made them for; and he that would find out a more ſuitable employment, or a more extended dominion for them, is *wiſe above what is written*; is wandering like a Vagabond, in the wilderneſs of imagination; and not like a Chriſtian Commentator on the Holy Bible, ſeeking out the true meaning of the Text, and fixing his foot, fearleſs of its being moved,

moved, where ever he finds it. And I repeat it, that Moſes hath ſaid as much about the ſtars, as about the ſun and moon, and joins them in the ſame dominion over the earth; placing them in the ſame firmament, to ſhine with a glory, tho' not equal to theirs, yet contributing to the great purpoſe of dividing light from darkneſs, or keeping up the expanſive force of the Heavens; and contributing alſo to the dividing between day and night; or regulating that action of the expanſion on the Earth, by which it is circulated in ſo uniform a manner. Moſes hath ſaid as much about the ſtars, as about any other part of the inanimate Creation; and as ſufficiently explained the particulars relating to them, it concerns us to be acquainted with. Would an account of their number, reſpective diſtances, ſizes, weight by our ſcales, with ſamples of their ſubſtance, been of any real uſe to us? with what face can Mr. Dodd ſay, *Moſes only mentions them briefly, to ſhew they were the workmanſhip of the ſame divine Creator, but doth not further enlarge upon them, as they did not belong to his ſubject?* He has enlarged upon them through five verſes, in which his ſubject is *the lights in the firmament of Heaven.* In other places Mr. Dodd falls in with the Infidel unawares; here it ſeems impoſſible, he ſhould not ſee he was running directly counter to the Text he was commenting upon. But he did not care to be laughed at, for making farthing candles of the ſtars, or braſs nails ſtuck in the ceiling; and robbing *Jupiter* of the glory of having an endleſs

leſs number of worlds under his juriſdiction. It is the faſhion in Philoſophy, that made him diſſemble what the Scriptures ſay ſo often, that the ſtars were made for lights to our Earth, and ſo not to other worlds. He does not aſſert a plurality of worlds, but ſuppreſſes what is point-blank contrary, in the divine writings, to that pleaſing, but miſchievous imagination.

Let us take a view of the Moſaic account of the creation, as it ſtands in the Text; and of the deluge, as far as the preſent diſpute is concerned.

In the beginning, God created the Heavens and the Earth.

At firſt, or formerly, as Pſal. cii. 25. לפנים Κατ' ἀρχας τα πρωτα, God gave being to the Heavens and the Earth, *and the Earth was without form and void.*

The earth, any more than the heavens, was not in the condition it is now, being then *formleſs, unformed, nulli ſua forma*; all within and without being a terraqueous mixture, without any concretion; but in a ſpherical ſhell, having a hollow, or void within it; not a ſolid ſphere, but *ſhell*; not filled with earth or water, but with heavenly matter, with *which* every place elſe is, which hath not ſolid matter in it, and which was then in the ſame condition the reſt of the heavenly matter was. The circumference of this terraqueous ſhell is about twenty-four thouſand miles; and what may we ſuppoſe was the diameter of the *void* in it? The ſhell wants only to be thick enough to hang together, being

being built like an arch, every way; and ſo has the ſtrength every way of an arch. Suppoſe its diameter then five hundred mile, though one hundred perhaps might be ſufficient; and *the void* will be ſeven thouſand miles in diameter, and one, or two and twenty thouſand in its circumference. And this muſt be filled partly with water, and partly air, in a body at the center, and the quantity of air muſt be equal to that of the water, which covered the outer face of the earth; which at the flood was a ſpherical cruſt of water, about twenty-four thouſand mile in circumference, and its thickneſs equal to the depth of the water; which was fifteen cubits above the higheſt mountains. A vaſt body of heaven this.

And darkneſs was upon the face of the deep.

Darkneſs, or heaven in the ſtate it is, where the ſpirit doth not breathe, or the light ſhine; ſuch as air is, in a deep dungeon.

God *created the darkneſs*, and it was upon the face of the deep, the terraqueous Chaos, and was what is called *Heaven* afterwards, unleſs it was annihilated, to make way for *the heaven*, to come in its room upon the earth. Revelation is ſilent, as to the extent of this darkneſs above the earth; nor can we meaſure it, or make any tolerably certain deductions about its height, as we may about the depth of that body of heaven, that filled *the void* of the Chaos at firſt, and near as great a quantity of which went back again thither at the deluge.

Darkneſs was upon the face of the deep;

The deep is the terraqueous chaotic mixture; and its

its face, its ſurface. Every ſhell, or hollow ſphere has an inſide, and an outſide; each of which, may perhaps be called *its face*, but *its face* muſt undoubtedly include its outſide, if it means any more; and if darkneſs covered its outſide, darkneſs, if there was no air in any other condition, muſt fill its inſide or *void* within; all is *full*, and ſomething muſt be every where.

And the ſpirit of God.

The darkneſs or ſtagnate air, being put into motion by the immediate power of God, *ſpiravit*, breathed, blew in ſuch a manner as *breath* does from the mouth; and is the ſame matter you *blow* out of a pair of bellows; and proceeding in the like manner.

Moved upon the face of the waters.

The ſpirit *moved*, our Engliſh ſays, the Hebrew, *brooded*, ſat as a bird upon an egg, preſt upon, and with a tremulous motion, hovered over the waters. It cannot penetrate water far, but will yet, by its incumbent weight, make the mud ſubſide a little way, and clear the water near the top; the ſpirit did that to the deep, and its turbid mixture was ſo far cleared, that the ſpirit lay upon the water. But it might have brooded, without end to no purpoſe, unleſs there had been light or heat for it to drive, or preſs into the midſt of the waters, and earthy matter.

And God ſaid let there be light.

A light in the darkneſs; and it would have appeared like a light in the night, a fire in the air: and was ſupported by the air, or the ſpi-

rit

rit alone; as lights in the air are for a time without any fixed ſettled feuel or fire place. And as the ſpirit from a pair of bellows blows into a fire, increaſes its heat, and forces out a ſtream of ſubtle matter, which mixes with the ſurrounding air or ſpirit; ſo here, the ſpirit preſt into *the light in the darkneſs*, forced out ſome of it, which muſt enter in among its own parts, ſwell them out, expand, and enable it by expanding, to compreſs alſo. And the longer this exchange continued, the further, wider and ſtronger, would the ſtruggle, or expanſive power extend; as we ſee fire does, the longer it burns; for ſpirit and light, are reciprocally changeable into each other, and will ſupport each other, as long as there is any thing to ſupport either of them. That *ſpirit* and *light*, were parts of the darkneſs ſpoken of before, follows, becauſe they are in the ſame place, upon the face of the deep. What diſtance ſoever the bulk of *the light* was from the earth, the ſpirit that acted between them, would ſoon fetch it down to the earth, and communicate its beneficial influence to it. What that diſtance was, we know not; but ſuited by wiſdom to anſwer the end propoſed.

God ſaw the light that it was good.

Approved of it as fit and proper for the purpoſes deſigned. And,

God divided between the light, and between the darkneſs.

Two wheels can't act alone, where three compleat the machine. Light flows from a fire, as long as the fire burns; and fire will burn till its

its feuel be waſted, and gradually increaſe in ſtrength, the longer it burns; if fuel be not wanting. Here was yet no fire-place, but *God divided between the light, and the darkneſs*, which we ſee done by every common fire, and v. 16. is the office of the ſolar fire, aſſiſted by its own ſtreams reflected back again, and the ſpirit that attends every ſtream of light. And he that can philoſophize upon the nature of a common fire, how it is fed by the ſpirit, ſupported only by the fuel, as a ſtage to act upon, will ſee how God *divided between the light and darkneſs*; the divine Workman doing no more, than ſupply the place of the fire, the reſt was mechanical, as it is now.

God called the light day, and the darkneſs he called night.

The ſtream of light, that like the ſun aroſe upon the earth, God called *day*; and the darkneſs on the oppoſite Hemiſphere, *night*. i. e. Eſtabliſhed day and night. Settled the courſe of nature, their alternate returns depend upon.

And it was evening.

Since the light aroſe, ſuppoſe in the Meridian of Eden, *it was become* evening. And ſo the natural day was paſt.

And it was morning.

It became morning, ſince or where it had been evening.

One day.

One artificial day, or nucthemeron was paſt or ended, at the morning of the ſecond day, during this time, the expanſion had been raiſing and

and extending itſelf, as a fire does gradually. And as ſoon as its influence reached the face of our globe, the globe turned; for on the light and ſpirit acting together, the day began, and *it became evening*; and then *a morning came*, and ſo on; which implys, [it does not in words ſay] that the earth turned. If you aſk what moves the earth, Moſes points with his finger to the *ſpirit and light*; the earth being ſet a going by the firmament.

God ſaid, let the firmament be in the midſt of the waters.

It was in being, or it could not have been ſpoken to. It was in being, becauſe *ſpirit and light* were; and the ſtruggle between them began with their birth, and will not end till they do; and at laſt will be made too ſtrong for the elements themſelves; *when the heavens being on fire ſhall be diſſolved, and the elements melt with fervent heat.* One element melts with heat, where ever fire is. The ſpirit is diſſolved, and more ſpirit ſucceeds, where ever light is in a body together; at laſt all the elements ſhall melt away with the fervent heat of the divine fire, and vaniſh to nothing. But the *Firmament* is the ſtruggle betwixt the *Light* and the *Spirit*, and God ſent it in among the waters, to

divide waters from waters.

Not to carry waters away, but only to divide or make a ſeparation between them. This is all the Text ſays.

And God made the firmament.

This was on the ſecond day. God raiſed it to its proper ſtrength by this time. *Made* it able to act, and to enter into the terraqueous ſhell, and ſeparate the earthy matter from the water; for the ſhell of the earth is, viſibly to the eye, many ſpherical ſtrata, ſediments out of water. And this ſhell muſt have water on both ſides of it.

And divided the waters, which were under the firmament, from the waters, which were above the firmament.

God did it, becauſe he did it by his agents; and more particularly as they were now in his immediate hand; ſince this, thoſe agents, &c. of the firmament, have been called *his hands*. He divided, or made a partition between the waters, as before. With what? What was there to do it with? Nothing but the earthy part of the chaotic mixture, that was concreted into a firm ſhell; and divided them, but it made no alteration in the ſituation of the waters, with reſpect to above and below. They were *below* before, and they were *above* before. Thoſe on the outſide of the earth were *below* the air that expanded and compreſſed them; and thoſe on the inſide of the earth were neceſſarily, on their ſeparation from the earthy matter, in a ſphere *over*, and ſo *above*, the void or body of air at the center; which air there was as neceſſary to the hatching the egg of the earth, as the little bladder of air in the hen's egg is to its being hatched. And this inner ſphere of water would ſurround the central air, till a communication

nication was opened through the ſhell of the earth; and then would immediately ruſh down, and force it up out of its place; but there was nothing to preſs it down, till the expanſion from above got hold of it, and drove the two ſpheres of water down together into one globe, at the center.

And God called the firmament Heaven.

The expanſion, or light and ſpirit in expanſion, God called, made or appointed שמים *Rulers*, or *Diſpoſers*; they had formed the earth, and ſo were appointed *Governors* over it.

And it was evening, and it was morning. A ſecond day.

An evening and a morning came. From the morning, when the day began, it was become evening; and from that evening it became morning again; a ſecond day. And ſo it was not a ſecond day over, till the morning of the third. Mat. xxviii. 1.

And God ſaid, let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place.

The waters under the heaven were to be removed; to be gathered to the others, and which were, *above the air*; all were to be in one place; to communicate together, and join each other. They were above and below before; and thoſe below were to go to thoſe above, that they might be in one place, and that the dry land might appear. They muſt be all above, or all below; for they were gathered together.

And let the dry land appear.

Which it did, when the waters ſunk away into the earth, and filling the void within, only appeared themſelves, at the mouths, or openings of the inlets, through which they retired to the one place prepared for them. It is evident that the dry land did not appear, till God ſaid, let it appear. And it is as evident that the waters, that covered the whole ſurface of the earth, muſt have ſome place to retire to, what ever my friend, Dodd, may think of the matter; ſome hollow or cavity below, not declivity of the ſurface, which they might fall away into.

And called the dry land earth.

That which will concrete, and *run*, break or crumble as mould, nay all the ſolid parts of the terraqueous mixture do, God called by eminence ארץ earth; naming it from this quality, without which there could be no vegetation. רץ is to *run*, *break*, or *crumble to pieces*; and ארץ a noun, with a formative א, as other nouns are formed.

And the gathering together of the waters called he Seas.

Seas, from the nature of water, *fluid*, eaſily put into *agitation*, without which, it could not have anſwered the end and uſe it was made for, in carrying on vegetation. It could not otherwiſe have been raiſed in ſteam or vapours out of the earth, or have run back again thither. And God named it from this quality, as the earth from its. And naming them from thence, is *making them ſuch*; and appointing a courſe of nature,

nature, that ſhall *continue* them ſuch. Water keeps the mould in its condition: and air, light, heat, or the expanſion, keeps the water *fluid*. Cold binds up both, and renders them uſeleſs for the time; but is greatly beneficial to perhaps both, however to the ground, for certain, afterwards

And God ſaid, let the earth bring forth the graſs-herb, yielding ſeed,

Let the earth ſupply matter for all the ſpecies of herbs, or vegetables, whoſe greens bear the ſeed.

And *the fruit tree yeilding fruit after his kind, whoſe ſeed is in it.*

Two grand claſſes of vegetables; the one, whoſe ſeed is produced in its greens or *herb*; the other in its fruit, as a tree: but עשב דשא is *not two ſpecies*, as we diſtinguiſh them, in our verſion, but one only. See ch. ii. 5. And the earth did no otherwiſe bring forth the *herb* or *tree*, than as it does now, by [through the agency of the expanſion] ſupplying *matter* for their growth; and water is the vehicle that conveys, or rather by which the expanſion conveys, the vegetable matter, and nouriſhes them; and water is compriſed in *earth*; and the *plant* of every claſs of vegetables was formed by the maker of all things, and ſet in the earth, and ſo the plant was before the ſeed. The earth could not form a ſeed; but it could nouriſh a plant, and that plant could form a ſeed. God doth not ſay, let the earth bring forth *the ſeed*;

but let it bring *forth the herb, yeilding ſeed,* מזריע זרע *ſeeding ſeed,* a hebraiſm for *forming its ſeed.* So ch. ii. 5. God made the plant, before it was in the ground. And it is doubly childiſh to talk of the wiſdom of God in the original proviſion of chaotic ſeeds.

And God ſaid, let there be lights in the firmament of heaven.

He ſays not how many, tho' there are two more particularly eminent for their ſervice to us; but here he ſpeaks of *all the lights in the firmament.* And tells us as much how they were made, as how any thing elſe was. *God ſaid let them be.* And he ſpoke to the Agents in nature; which he had ſufficiently deſcribed by their ſeveral names, *Spirit, Light, Expanſion, the Rulers*; and whoſe power and agency we may be ſufficiently apprized of, by looking at a common culinary fire. Here was ſpirit and light, but no *fire*, otherwiſe than as a body of light together acts in the nature of fire. Now God ſaid, let there be מארת marth, *inſtruments for the uſe of light*; to make, and diffuſe it; all placed in *the expanſion of heaven*; in the ſubſtance of heaven, acting by expanſion, without which, the fire of the ſun could not burn; nor the light be conveyed either to, or brought from, the moon and ſtars to us. Moſes doth not here ſo much as tell us, which of theſe lights are on fire; or which only repel and reverberate the light back again. He only ſays, they are *all inſtrumental to light.* As he had before told us that light was *darkneſs in flux*; ſo

that

that darkneſs *divided, diſſolved, melted* by fire, flows out of the ſun, [we may ſuppoſe principally] and being preſt againſt the many ſurrounding orbs, is beat back again into the ſphere the earth moves in. And if the moon, an opaque body, can reflect ſo much light, the ſtars may be no more, than meer opaque bodies, made for ſtops or checks, to turn back the ſtreams of light down to the ſun, and ſo to our earth; and have but a ſecondary power; a ſecond-hand rule in the œconomy of nature. And if their worſhips, or their worſhippers, are not ſatisfied with this ſhare of power, they muſt e'en try to get more by themſelves, or their vaſſals here. And the light might be before the ſun, if the ſun be only a fire, that generates it out of of air, as every common fire, and every farthing candle, as I ſaid, does. But if blindneſs is happened to Iſrael, in ſo great degree as heretofore, as not to be able to truſt their ſenſes, and tho' they ſee, they will not believe; why, they muſt ſtumble on in the dark. The lights were ſet in the firmament.

To divide the day from the night.

This the light in the hand of God had hitherto done; and now the ſame light does it; only it is ſent out by the ſun, and reflected, or rebounded by the ſeveral heads of the many ſtars of light.

And let them be for ſigns, and for ſeaſons, and for days and years.

Had the light flowed all from one point upon the earth, I apprehend, the direction of its di-

urnal motion of the earth muſt neceſſarily have coincided with that of the annual; and there could have been nothing that might mechanically have kept its axis parallel to itſelf, but with a variable Angle to the plane of its Orbit. *Signs* are extraordinary events, ſuch as come not like morning and evening, ſummer and winter, regularly and in a *ſet* manner, as *ſeaſons* ſignifies; but occaſionally. Such are Eclipſes, the appearance of a Comet, and I may add, rain, ſtorms and tempeſts in the air, whirlwinds, thunder and lightning. The different phaſes of the moon are as regular as the ſeaſons of the day, or the year; and ſo are hardly to be reckoned among thoſe *ſigns* in the heavens, which the heathen were, but the ſervant of God was not to be afraid of. *Seaſons* of the year, as well as difference in the length of our days, depend, we know, upon the declination; מועד is any *ſet time*, *thing* or *appointment*. The lights of heaven are to make *ſigns*, *ſeaſons*, *days* and *years*; and therefore on their light muſt depend the double motion of the earth, that of all the moveable ſtars, and the riſing of thoſe vapours into the air, that are ſo neceſſary and beneficial to us, as well as thoſe which are ſo pernicious. The queſtion is not *how* the lights of heaven *circulate* the moving Orbs, and *regulate* their motions; but whether Moſes aſcribes this to their influence, or not, and this he does, by aſcribing the *ſigns* and *ſeaſons*, *days* and *years* to their juriſdiction; and they govern by giving light upon the earth.

God

God ſet them in the firmament of heaven, to give light upon the earth; and to rule over the day, and over the night; and to divide the light from the darkneſs.

All depends upon their giving light, by the expanſion of heaven, the direction of the ſeveral ſtreams, and quantity of the whole. And when God varies the ſet ſeaſons in degree, or ſends forth *the ſigns*, it is, as at firſt, by the agents of nature, and God ſays, *let this* or *that be*, and the ſervant obeys him. The grand operation is *dividing between the light, and the darkneſs.* Ipſe dixit is ſufficient from the prophet.

Gen. vii. 11. *The ſame day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened.*

The word of God did this, and a few words deſcribe the dreadful ſcene. *I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth*; ſays God. And he did it, by breaking up *the fountains*, the larger cracks and fiſſures in the ſhell of the earth, thro' which the water flows; and opening or widening the leſſer cracks, thro' which the air occaſionally paſſes and repaſſes; and the finer vapours, or water riſes in ſteam. This was at once overturning the foundations of the earth; and raiſing up that, till now hidden treaſure of bleſſings, the *waters of the great deep. The bleſſings of the deep that lieth under*, Gen. xlix. 25. and Deut. xxxiii. 19. *the abundance of the ſeas: and the treaſures hid in the ſands.* And v. 13. *the deep that coucheth beneath*; and pouring them out for a curſe upon the earth.

earth. And thoſe waters aroſe by the ſame means, or were raiſed by the ſame agents, and came up thro' the ſame paſſages, only greatly widened and enlarged, by the immediate hand of God upon them, as the leſſer quantity of vapours ariſe, and fall in rain now.

V. 17. *And the flood was forty days upon the earth.*

So at v. 4. "I will cauſe it to rain upon the earth forty days, and forty nights; and every living ſubſtance that I have made, will I deſtroy from off the face of the earth." By that time then, the flood was riſen to its height, and the higheſt hills muſt be covered, or men and beaſts, birds at leaſt, would have found reſt there. And ſo we are expreſsly told,

The flood was forty days upon the earth; and the waters *increaſed—and all the high hills, that were under the whole heaven, were covered—and all fleſh died*;

Within the compaſs of thoſe forty days; for ſo the text plainly ſays.

V. 24. *And the waters prevailed upon the earth, an hundred and fifty days.*

From the beginning of the rain, till the decreaſe of the waters began, was 150 days. But the water aroſe no higher, at the end of forty days; and then the paſſages of water up, and of air down, were cloſed; and continued ſo an 110 days.

Ch. viii. 1. *God remembered Noah, and every living thing, and all the cattle, that was with him in the Ark.*

And

And ſo put an end to thoſe convulſions of nature, which the whole crew of *the Noah*, tho' ſaved from their immediate violence, muſt have ſunk under the influence of.

And God made a wind to paſs over the earth.

Made the ſpirit return to its rout again, and go on again in its courſe. That courſe therefore had been ſtopt, and its preſſure ſuſpended; and indeed without that, the air could not have gone down, and the waters aſcended into the clouds, in thoſe cataracts of one and the other, in quantities ſufficient for one to drown the earth, and the other to ſupply its place below. Nor could the exuviæ of trees and ſmaller plants have been preſerved. God ſet this agent a going again, in its full force, and uſual courſe; עבר *ſet it forward.*

And the waters were aſſwaged.

Not abated, fal'n or ſunk lower; but ſtood where they were; aroſe no higher; the reaſon appears from the next words;

And the fountains of the deep, and the air-cracks *were ſtopped.*

If the water could not paſs the larger fiſſures up, the air could not go thro' the leſſer one's down; here both were cloſed up; and the ſhell of the earth conſiſted of *ſtrata*, or what would ſoon be *ſtrata*, whole and entire, without any cracks or fiſſures in it. It was all a mud.

And the rain from heaven was reſtrained:

In conſequence of the communication betwixt the deep and the Atmoſphere being ſhut up. No rain can fall, but as an equal quantity of matter

matter aſcends ſomewhere into the Atmoſphere, to ſupply its place. And this was before the end of the 150 days, becauſe it was,

V. 3. *After the end of the hundred and fifty days, the waters were abated,*

Or began to fail; which it was impoſſible they ſhould do, whilſt the inlets to the great abyſs were all cloſed; and which they would neceſſarily begin to do, as ſoon as they were opened; and therefore they were all ſtopt, as ſoon as the flood was got to its height; and Noah's crew had 110 days to breathe in; and the ſhell of the earth as many, gradually to ſettle into ſtrata in; to be formed within ſide, once more *hatched* by the brooding of the ſpirit, whoſe ſuſpenſion was taken off, at forty days end, and continued ſitting upon its egg for 110 days, when the ſhell cracked, and the water began to ſink thro' the cracks, and fail from off the earth; tho', but very gradually.

And the Ark reſted in the ſeventh month, on the ſeventeenth day of the month.

The very day the ſhell of the earth was again broken up; for from ſix months and ſeventeen days, take one month and ſeventeen days, when the flood began; and you have five months, which at thirty days to a month, make *the hundred and fifty days*; when the waters began to abate, and the ſeventeenth day of the ſeventh month, when the Ark reſted; as it was neceſſary it ſhould, before the ſtorms, or violent commotions in the air above, and the waters beneath, began again, on each returning to their proper

proper home; the ſhip muſt elſe have been wrackt, and all that was valuable under heaven loſt with it. This doubtleſs was the richeſt cargo, that ever floated in a ſhip upon the ſea; we need not except even that, in which the Prince of the power of the Air, would have ſunk the Lord of the Air and life too, in the ſea of Gennaſeret; for he himſelf was now in the loins of Shem.

"——*Upon the mountains of Ararat*,"

N. B. In Armenia; from whence was an eaſy conveyance down to the Euphrates, and by that to the land of Shinar, where they had lived before the flood. The neceſſaries and conveniences of life, we may conclude they had ſaved from the wrack of the old world; and might break up *the Noah* itſelf, and uſe the materials. Nor would they forget the utenſils of the houſe of God, its tents, or tenting for themſelves; all which might eaſily be conveyed by water carriage, as they travelled old Eden-ward, down the river, and which its ſtream directed them to.

V. 5. *In the tenth month, on the firſt day of the month, were the tops of the mountains ſeen.*

V. 14. *And in the ſecond month, on the ſeven and twentieth day of the month, was the earth dried.*

So that the water was ſinking for one month and thirteen days, before the tops of the mountains were bared. And it was forty days after, before a raven could ſave itſelf upon the ground. So very gradually and ſlowly did the waters retire, in compariſon with thoſe that went off the earth,

earth, at its firſt formation: the dry land appeared then after two days; now it is as many months before the dove could find a reſt for her foot. Muſt not the inlets at firſt be larger, and more directly down, and conſequently fewer than thoſe at the ſecond formation? ſo that the water fell in a body at once, like a weight down a well. And was it not owing to the greater ſolidity of the firſt ſhell, that it broke into larger, and fewer cracks of courſe than the preſent ſhell? And might not that greater ſolidity be owing to the chaotic maſs, having leſs of the matter of the heavens intermixed with it, than the preſent earth had, at the new making it; having been all diſſolved, and the air and water paſſing between, perhaps every atom of its body? And muſt not that have an influence on the Atmoſphere, which is ſupplied from the abyſs thro' that ſhell? It muſt, one would think, be more temperate, and leſs ſtored with noxious mineral exhalations, when the ſhell wanted thoſe numberleſs ſmall, and to our eye, inviſible paſſages, thro' which they make their way up to us. And vegetables, which the beaſts eat, and ſo the vegetables and beaſts which men fed upon; [for there is no reaſon, but the wrong conſtruction of one text, to ſuppoſe they did not eat fleſh,] would be ſounder and wholeſomer food; and this with the healthier air, would contribute to their longævity. But this I muſt leave to better heads.

Mr. Dodd's Conference, in 1761.

Mr.

Mr. Dodd in his *Conference*, publiſhed in 1761, and ſince publickly owned by him, upbraids the Editors of Mr. H--n's works, with ſaying, *his writings preſent the Bible and Religion to you, in quite another dreſs*, than, *he* ſays, all other Chriſtian writers; but *they* ſay, than the Infidels and half Chriſtians, Deiſts, and your Natural-religioniſts had done; inſtances of which they ſpecify in the pages preceeding the 24th, which he refers to *Conf.* p. 20. As to *Religion*, I need only ſay at preſent, compare what Mr. H--n, hath written, with what thoſe Commentators have written, who extract their account of *the tranſactions recorded in ſcripture*, from the apoſtate Jews; ſee the Editor's Preface, p. 21. And I repeat it, after them, that *his writings do preſent the Bible and Religion to you, in quite another dreſs*; but that *they, and they only, place the ſcriptures, and the divine revelation, on a proper and ſolid footing*, is not ſo much as hinted by the Editors, and it is a down right falſe accuſation, as that alſo he brings from *Religion of Satan*, againſt the *Clergy*, (Note o in this page :) unleſs the *apoſtate Jews* are the only writers on the divine revelation. And he makes here, as in the next page alſo, that *general*, which only regards, and that with great truth, a *particular* ſet of men. As to the natural philoſophy of the Bible, I appeal no further than to the learned Commentary juſt now in my hands; and it fully juſtifies the Editors of Mr. H--n's works, on that head. Mr. Dodd hath, he ſays, *diligently conſulted all the beſt, and moſt*

able

able writers upon the ſacred Scriptures, with the Jewiſh writers, to the number of, I can't tell how many; and therefore we may conclude, he hath *compreſſed and conſolidated the light*, to be had from them, into a body of natural philoſophy, the beſt that could be had, from ſo many Chriſtian writers, beſides the Jewiſh, for the benefit of his reader; and what that is, we have juſt ſeen. I would not ſuppoſe he has played thoſe *able writers* falſe, and given us, as their ſenſe, what they never give, as their own; for in truth, many of them are able writers; but rather, that he has only dipped into ſome of them, or that they have not pretended to explain the creation, or the flood; but taking it for granted, as in good manners I muſt, that he has read them all, and that he could get nothing better from them, than what we have been a conſidering, let him blame no man for ſaying, a better account was wanted, than they could give, till he has juſtified that account to the world. *Darkneſs* he annihilates; the Spirit he makes a God of; the Light he makes a Ghoſt of; it comes in and out at the key-hole, is nothing, but juſt while it appears; it ſlides about, comes, is gone; nobody knows where, nor how; nor what becomes of it, or what it is fed and ſupported by, while it is here; in ſhort, he might as well have called it a *non-privation of darkneſs*, as he does darkneſs a privation of light, and rid his hands, as he hath his thoughts, of the trouble of both at once. His Chaos is a moſt curious *olla podrida*, and I have ſet it before the

the reader, as a curioſity. The firmament, called the ſtrength of God, is dwindled down into the elaſticity of the air; the waters that covered the whole ſurface, and fill the great womb of the earth, he lodges in the mouths of that great ſea; ſtoring the atmoſphere, tho' with a body of them, thick enough to have as entirely darkened the ſun, and intercepted all benefit from it to the earth, as a braſs wall would have done, for ſixteen hundred years to the flood, that the clouds might have rain enough, for fear the great deep ſhould not, to drown the earth; and down they come; and then run off the *declivity* of the earth into the ſeas, which now could hold them all, but before were not big enough; and what was very good of them, they were ſo civil as not to mount again to their cock-loft in the air, leſt every Bumpkin ſhould laugh at their being there, when it was viſible that they were not. There are other curious obſervations and diſcoveries in Mr. Dodd's notes, which I have taken pains to expand, for the benefit of careleſs readers; for he has an art of compreſſing *his matter* together, that you ſhall often find more of it in four lines in him, than in twice four pages in *Behmen* or *Bunyan*. But I have done with them for the preſent, till what relates to the revelation of chriſtianity comes, together with his explanation of the Cherubim; when perhaps we may lay our loggerheads together once more; only I muſt now have a word or two with him, on ſome paſſages in his *Conference*.

He offers to ridicule, p. 22. which he has but as aukward an hand at, as he has at complimenting. See his preface, " what can we, who *love* you, further wiſh, than the *long and full* enjoyment of *all* theſe *bleſſings?*" what further you aukward booby! why truly a tranſlation from St. David's to Canterbury; if it were only to change your P. of B. into a P. of C. A paſſage from Mr. H--n. vol. i. 119. about nodules, ſhould he ever live to have a conception of what a nodule is, and how irrefragable an argument they are, againſt gravity and the atheiſtical properties in matter, he will bluſh for himſelf. In the mean time, if he thinks he can chew a nodule, let him try his teeth upon the grit I have laid in his diſh. I fancy he will find that rather too hard for them; but, before he ſtands forth as a Champion for the gravitarian Philoſophy, let him renounce his own half bred plenum, and go one lecture or two, that he may underſtand the common terms. He ſays, p. 24.

" Mr. H--n is fond of inſinuating, that *we* have *wholly* followed the *Rabbi*'s in our interpretation of *S. Scripture.*" We apples! now indeed our learned Commentary may be appealed to, where *we* have conſulted *all the beſt Chriſtian writers, with the Jewiſh writers,* whom thoſe Chriſtian ones moſtly followed, in the points the Editors are reproached with ſaying, Mr. H--n has given us the beſt inſight into; and then cites a paſſage from the Editors Preface, Conf. p. 24, 25. which diſproves what it

it is cited for; they only complaining, that *for the moſt part*, the learned have been led by the Rabbies; and that in ſome *peculiar* parts of Scripture; and by *the learned*, not meaning *all*; becauſe Mr. H--n hath cited many, and filled a volume with extracts out of ſome, who proteſt as ſtrongly againſt the Rabbies, and make as great an out-cry againſt Chriſtians, for truſting them, as he has done. But this ſort of pecking is below a man; and ſhews only a quarrelſome idle turn of mind, that generally produces fibbing, as my land-lady tells the little miſſes, when they are bringing ſtories againſt one another; and I find ſhe is in the right of it; for Mr. Dodd hath ſo chaffed himſelf with it, that out bounces a monſtrous fib againſt Dr. Hodges's *Conf.* p. 27.

" The Rev. Dr. Hodges hath [in his Elihu, p. 55. 8vo.] produced a paſſage from Irenæus, which, *as he hath quoted it*, *ſeems to wear ſome appearance* of favour towards the Hutchinſonian interpretation of Cherubim——while *ſuch quotations* prove, that they are not able to engage theſe venerable writers in their party."

Hath not the doctor quoted it *fairly* then? or hath he drawn any inference from it, which Irenæus hath not? Dr. Sharpe, in his Cherubim, p. 290. cites the paſſage that the Cherubim were τετραπροσωπα. και τα προσωπα αυτων εικονες της πραγματειας τυ υιυ τυ Θευ.

" To this he objects, that προσωπα αυτων muſt mean *their faces*, and not their *perſons*. Neither are the faces ſaid by *Irenæus*, to be

εικονες of *perſons*, but of the diſpenſation of the Son of God;" with more to this purpoſe, to evade the force of it; and [at top of the page,] *that this being ſingled out, and detached from the context, ſeems greatly to countenance Mr. H--n's Chriſtian Covenant in Hieroglyphicks.* The oblique reflection of Dr. Sharpe's, on his integrity, made Dr. Hodges produce the whole paſſage in his *Strictures*, ſee p. 15, & ſeq. where he blames Dr. Sharpe for not himſelf producing what he thought omitted; [but that did not comport with the doctor's deſign,] and ſhews that he had fairly and honeſtly cited, and ſufficiently too, to juſtify all he brings *Irenæus* for; which was to prove that the Cherubim had four faces, or was a quadruple figure, and that the deſign of it was to *repreſent the diſpenſation of the Son of God.* Dr. Sharpe cites another paſſage or two, which have very little, or no relation to the words in diſpute, and which he did not think proper to cite himſelf; tho' he upbraids Dr. Hodges with *detaching* his citation from the context.—"Had the worthy A. D. ſays Dr. Hodges, uſed the ſame candour in his critic, upon the paſſage from *Irenæus*——had every material part relating to the S. Emblems been produced; [ſc. by him] the public then might have ſeen, that *Irenæus* had named, and expreſsly alluded to, the figures of the Cherubim, as to well known Emblems." He then gives the whole paſſage at large, by which it appears that Dr. Hodges had been ſo far from detaching, what he did cite from the context,

to

to countenance his own opinion, that he had only hurt his own argument, by not citing more; when all this, and more to the ſame purpoſe, lay before him; for Mr. Dodd to accuſe Dr. Hodges of diſhoneſty in his quotation, with *as he hath quoted, it ſeems to wear ſome appearance of favour*, is not, it is true, *the accuſation direct* but only *conſtructive*; but as direct a *falſehood*, as arrant a fib, as if he had directly charged him with it. But to another point;

" Let it be remembered, that he [Chriſt] refers rather to the Greek, ſince he follows in the general, the interpretation of the LXX, as do alſo the Apoſtles. Conf. p. 29.

I cite this, not for the blunder in it of making Chriſt cite, or refer to the Greek, but to ſhew that Mr. Dodd well deſerves that character, for candour and ſincerity he gives himſelf, both in his *Conference* and *Commentary*; by condemning with ſo much venom a cauſe, the merits of which he has not conſidered; for if he had, he would have ſeen that Dr. Sharpe had made the ſame fauxpas, and ſmarted under it. He felt the medling with the Greek citations; and the blunder of making our Lord the writer of the new Teſtament. Chriſt ſpoke Hebrew, in his diſputes with the Jews, and common diſcourſe, not Greek. And our church ſends us to the Hebrew, as Chriſt did; and juſtified themſelves for their new tranſlation, by ſhewing that no verſion can be ſet up againſt the original. And being maligned in almoſt the ſame language by ſome *brethren*, whom

they ſay not, juſtified themſelves ſo well in their *preface to the tranſlation*, that it hath furniſhed us with arguments in our defence, which the ſeveral oppoſers of Mr. H--n, from Dr. Bedford to Mr. Dodd, never did, nor ever can reply to. They repeat the objection, but never replied to the anſwer. Nay Dr. Sharpe confeſſed the truth there. And Dodd, had he been then in a maſque, would hardly have ventured to have medled with that knotty point; and his *beyond all meaſure aſtoniſhment* is an amazing piece of ignorance, both of which he may cure, by looking into the preface to the tranſlation of the Bible. It is another fib to ſay, that

" The Hutchinſonians hold nothing in lower eſteem, than the very antient and uſeful verſion of the ſeventy."

They hold it in the higheſt eſteem, as without which, mankind could not have come to the ſenſe of the Hebrew, unleſs perhaps their not holding it in equal eſteem with the original, is holding it in no eſteem. But will he undertake the defence of the LXX, now he hath pulled off his maſque? if he will, I'll pull off mine. I ſay with our tranſlators of the Bible, and with Bp. Hare, as a verſion, it is a *bad one*; and with Mr. H--n, as a key to the Hebrew, it is a *great bleſſing* to the Chriſtian World. If this be all the honour it deſerves, and that no little honour too; it is no leſs than what the Hutchinſonians always give it. Oh! Sir, leave off fibbing: it may be a courtly neceſſarium, but it is no Chriſtian virtue.

Etymo-

Etymology, is the derivation and meaning of words; which the new Teſtament ſo often builds the Chriſtian doctrines upon, as predicted in names and titles in the old Teſtament. This *Etymological evidence*, Mr. Dodd ſuppoſes, whether ignorantly or no, I know not, to be that which Mr. Holloway purſues in his *originals*; Conf. p. 30. juſt as if *ſplitting of roots* was the ſame as finding the meaning of thoſe roots, by their uſage in Scripture. What ſpirit does ſuch perverſe compariſons proceed from? Splitting of roots is *arbitrary* and *precarious*, no doubt; ſearching the Scriptures to find the meaning of the roots, is that therefore *arbitrary* and *precarious?* Oh! for ſhame. St. Paul conſtrues Melchiſedec to be *king of righteouſneſs*; and proves the nature of Chriſt's Preiſthood, from his being Prieſt after the order of *Melchiſedec*; this is building upon the Etymology of the words, and meaning of *Melchi* and *Sedec*. Another comes and ſplits מלך into three or four roots; does this whimſical revery affect the Apoſtle's argument, or way of reaſoning? becauſe one ſplits a root, another muſt not build upon the meaning of it. But what has Mr. H--n to do with the ſeparate opinions of thoſe who read his writings? or what has one who reads thoſe writings to do with the peculiar opinion of another who reads them? Every one that approves in general of Mr. H--n's writings, he nick names an *Hutchinſonian*, and then talks of the Hutchinſonians as a ſect, who ſubſcribe a ſet of articles, and are reſponſible each

for the other; and ſmells high church and low church, Popery and Fanatiſm, with *non-reſiſtance* and *paſſive obedience*; principles dangerous to an eſtabliſhed government, breeding *per accidens* in the *Hutchinſonian* ſyſtem; and this ſays he, *if need were, might be exemplified.* p. 11. *They are known,* ſays he, *to be as high in their political, as in their religious ſentiments*; what *they?* all the Hutchinſonians doth he mean? let him look into the City of London, and enquire into the *political* and *religious ſentiments* of thoſe, who read his writings there. But Dodd ſays, *ſome* have preached up *non-reſiſtance* and *paſſive obedience*, then why did he ſay *they are known?* will he charge all with what he thinks wrong in the principles of *ſome?* But by *what accident* is it, that any of the principles of our many modern diviſions ſhould ſpring from fire, light and ſpirit, or the Cherubim? or what connection is there betwixt ſtudying the Hebrew without points, and politicks? none. But Mr. Dodd wanted to *point out perſons, mention names, and iſſue forth thoſe declarations, by which they are to be caſt down, and himſelf raiſed up.* And ſo, *Blaco* like, in the true ſpirit of the ſpy, would raiſe the jealouſy and ſuſpicions of the government againſt the innocent; that he may reap the advantage of an officious pretended zeal. If I gueſs right whom he means, that he could *exemplify* what he ſays in, they are men no ways, in any reſpect, his inferiors for learning or character; and men, whom the government is as ſafe from, and much ſafer, ſhould any op-

portu-

portunity offer, than from any *Blaco*, or over officious informer. Hath he ſo much more of the ——— in him, than he ſeems to think of, as to endeavour to tack the notion of the diſpleaſure of the government, to the ſtudy of the Hebrew Scriptures? and counterballance the command of *ſearching the Scriptures*, with an, *he is not Cæſar's friend that does ſo? We have no king but Cæſar.* But the *Hutchinſonian tenets are derogatory to the honour of God.* To this purpoſe, *an attentive reader is to refer to Mr. H--n's interpretation* of *Aleim.* p. 30. Does he mean thoſe blaſphemous notions, fathered upon that interpretation by Drs. Bedford, Sharpe, and ſome other writers? He inſtances not in any particular. Nor any is there for him to inſtance in, to his purpoſe, but what a criminal prepoſſeſſion, and malitious over haſte, induced the above gentlemen to charge it with. And tho' often, and often called upon in print, would never make any anſwer; but only, as if the charges were acknowledged, kept repeating them, and ſo will Mr. Dodd, I ſuppoſe. But further, Mr. H--n and his followers deny *eternal generation*, and ſome have called it *eternal non ſenſe.* I am glad they are not charged with denying the *co-equality and co-eternity of the whole three perſons together*, or condemned for believing the Divinity of Chriſt, as I was afraid they would, from that paſſionate cenſure paſt on Mr. Romaine's ſermon, p. 52. Who ſays no more than the Creed does, that it is *neceſſary to Everlaſting Salvation*, to believe that Chriſt is *perfect God* and

perfect

perfect Man. But let every man anſwer for himſelf. No man is bound to anſwer for another, in any particular he does not eſpouſe him in; and it is from the true ſpirit of *religious controverſy*, ſo pathetically lamented, and ſo ſaintiſhly diſavowed in the beginning of this reconciling *conference*, by our Author, that he deals ſo much in this ſtrain of bringing ſtories, pecking, fibbing, and ſetting friends together by the ears.

" *But the foundation of morality* is *alſo ſhaken by Mr. H--n*, who ſuppoſes the *ten Commandments, to have their primary reference, not* to *men's moral actions, but to Idolatry.*" p. 31.

Mr. Dove ſuppoſes that to be the *primary deſign* of the *decalogue*, but Mr. H--n only ſays, he hopes *they will include theſe*, viz. Faith, and the true ſpirit of it, the love of God and man, in the deſign of the ten Commandments; and not to make what is called *morality*, the only qualification of the Chriſtian; and refers to Eccl. xii. 13. *Fear God, and keep his Commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.* And ſo I think we are told in the new Teſtament; and what Mr. Dodd cites this of Mr. H--n for, to prove that he was deſtroying the foundation of morality, unleſs he had a mind to diſpute with Solomon, and he that is greater than Solomon too, I can't ſee.

" *Fear the Aleim and keep his Commandments*, (ſays H--n, works, vol. ix. 103.) [ſays Dodd] was the duty of man."

And

And does not Solomon ſay it? he doth not ſeem to have obſerv'd that it was cited from Solomon, for he omits the reference, Eccleſ. xii. 13. becauſe it happens to ſtand before, and not after the text. And Mr. H--n is ſhewing the neceſſity of the atonement by Chriſt, his mediation and aſſiſtance of the holy Spirit, to our recovery from the Fall, and that *the moral law*, which ſome have ſuppoſed had no relation to *faith*, or our belief of the above doctrines, was all that was compriſed in the ten Commandments; and Mr. H--n hopes they will include thoſe doctrines in it for the future; and he is ſo far from deſtroying morality, that he is there building it upon the ſole foundation it can, or ever did ſubſiſt on. And Mr. Dodd's is a baſe ſlander upon him; for *Faith*, *Hope*, *Charity*, are the ſteps he took in religion; and is there pleading for. But ſuppoſe he had thought, that the breaches made in the moral part of religion by Idolatry were what occaſioned that ſolemn promulgation of the decalogue from Mount Sinai, how would, or does that ſap the foundation of morality? Are they leſs the Commandments of God, or leſs obligatory upon us, becauſe E. G. *ſpiritual adultery* gave occaſion to the law that prohibits carnal adultery? and ſtealing for burnt ſacrifice, to the law that prohibits all ſtealing? It is a meer ſpeculative point. And Mr. H--n, if he has any where ſaid any thing that tends that way, which I don't recollect, or Mr. Dove, may ſurely enjoy their noſtrum, or publiſh it, without offence, where none is either given, or intend-

intended. But the core lies deeper; natural-religion, that enemy of Chriſtianity and common ſenſe, is attacked, and in danger too, from what Meſſrs. H--n and Dove have advanced on that head; and none but your pr--nt hunters, who have read their writings, ever bow the head to that golden Idol. Mr. Dove had not, I ſuppoſe, a learned education, but writes like a man, and a ſcholar, and his writings may ſhame thoſe who pride themſelves in their education. And when Mr. Dodd can equal him in ſenſe, method or ſtile, I would adviſe him to look a little more narrowly into his writings, and endeavour to ſet them in their true light, for the benefit of others, if he thinks he eſpies any miſchief in them.

I have uſed pretty plain language with Mr. Dodd, but I hope no more than the nature of the caſe required. I have not been angry, tho' when dead freinds are belyed, and living ones ſlandered and informed againſt, it might be thought there was ſome room for indignation; I have only laid aſide ceremony, as he hath done *good manners*; without turning up my eyes, and canting about candour, patience and moderation, as a blind to others; tho' it only ſerves to hood-wink one's ſelf, and hide from one's own eyes that *equivocal candour* and *falſe zeal*, which lyes, be-lyes, and would even kill for God's ſake; ſpecimens of which Mr Dodd gives us, whilſt he is preaching againſt it. He ſounds the trumpet to war, and in the ſtile of the old gothic challenge, proclaims the H--n's enemies

enemies to God and the king, and to all the people; in *ſhaking the foundation of morality; derogating from the honor of God, and being diſaffected to the government. Jamque faces et ſaxa volant*, and all for the ſake of peace and quietneſs. He concludes,

Let the follower of Mr. *Hutchinſon drop his vain philoſophy*, which he himſelf has adopted; *his quaintneſs of allegory*, brought in only for the ſake of the quaintneſs of the expreſſion; *and his cabaliſtical conceits*, who of all men deſpiſed the Cabala, and wrote chiefly againſt the errors introduced into the church from the Jewiſh writers, whom he always treats as apoſtates, and enemies to the truth and common ſenſe; and whoſe charges againſt cabaliſtical writers Mr. Dodd and ſome others twiſt and turn, as charges in him againſt Chriſtians; and now he is a *Cabaliſt*; and as for *allegory*, he follows St. Paul, in ſuppoſing *the law had a ſhadow of the good things to come*. And now I have done, and ſhall only add, that I am related to the Giffard family, tho' by the ſurer ſide, and ſo do not carry the name; my own ſurname I chuſe to ſuppreſs for the preſent; intending only to whiſper it about by and by, that I may not loſe the credit of my performance among my friends; which is all, in conformity to his own example, Mr. Dodd can reaſonably demand from me.

What follows came in MSS into my hands, by miſtake I ſuppoſe, among ſome other papers, ſome years ago; and is not altogether foreign to the matter before us, being wrote againſt the Rev.

Rev. Mr. Ralph Heathcote, who about eight or nine years ago, uſed Mr. H--n, and thoſe who were willing to take the benefit of his annotations on Scripture, much in the ſame manner Mr. Dodd has done; and by whom indeed the flame of his zeal ſeems to have been kindled. Some part of it relates to *the uſe of reaſon*, in anſwer to Mr. Heathcote on that head. And if Mr. Dodd thinks Mr. Heathcote hath not made the moſt of his argument, he hath an opportunity of helping his friend at a dead lift; whether it be in print already, or the Author, whoever he is, deſigned to publiſh it himſelf, or did not deſign it ſhould be publiſhed, I aſk pardon for doing it.

FINIS.

BRITISH
19 JY 77
MUSEUM

THE USE of REASON IN MATTERS of RELIGION, AND Mr. HUTCHINSON VINDICATED, FROM THE Aſperſions of the Rev. Mr. HEATHCOTE.

——And ſhall ſay all manner of Evil againſt you falſely for my Sake.
Matth. v. 11.

BRITISH MUSEUM

To the READER.

A Late attempt to deſtroy the uſe and purpoſe of Revelation, under the title of, *The Uſe of Reaſon, in matters of Religion; or natural Religion, the foundation of revealed*, together with ſome reflections on Mr. H–n, Dr. Patten, and others, as enemies to common ſenſe, and the civil government; this violent Pamphlet called, it was apprehended, for ſome animadverſions; for tho' they, who read Dr. Patten's ſermon, and Mr. H--n's works, with the leaſt impartiality, will ſee them in a quite different light, than Mr. Heathcote has thought proper to repreſent thoſe Authors and their writings in; yet ſome, who have not patience to read a large work, will run thro' a ſhort one; the Reader will then, I hope, excuſe the trouble of this, which I ſhall make as ſhort as I can; and may, after that, the better judge, whether thoſe gentlemen are ſuch enemies to religion and government, as they are accuſed of being; or, their writings tend, as I hope, they will appear to do, to the eſtabliſhment of our hearts in the true Chriſtian faith, and in love and unity with one another. And whether their zeal be according to knowledge, and kept within thoſe bounds, which might be reaſonably expected in a conteſt with the perverſeſt of men, and moſt dangerous of enemies, I mean

Scepticks, and unbelievers; whether confeſſedly or undeſignedly ſuch; whether under the title of Philoſophers, Arians, Deiſts, Reaſoners, Quakers; or any others, who ſet up any other ſtandard or teſt of divine truths, than the word of God. The deſign of Dr. Patten in his excellent ſermon, is to enforce *Revelation* as the ſole rule of faith and manners; and miracles and propheſy, as plain and full proof of what was revealed. And he as done ſo in a ſtile and method, as well as with a deſign, and in a manner, that gained him the approbation of the Univerſity of Oxford; and accordingly the *Vice-chancellor, and other heads of houſes*, requeſted the publication of it; and it has already gone thro' a ſecond Edition. The approbation of ſo learned and venerable a body might have ſecured, one would have thought, the doctor from that virulence of language and animoſity, Mr. Heathcote hath exerted againſt him. He calls the doctor's *an uncommon ſermon, that doth not underſtand its own text——deſtroys human reaſon, and the powers thereof——ſtifles and extinguiſhes our common notions of things——that inculcates before a great and famous univerſity; ſuch a ſpirit of ignorance, bigotry, and fanaticiſm, as one would ſcarce expect from the pooreſt and moſt illiterate Methodiſt in a barn——through which runs ſuch a bitterneſs of ſpirit, as perhaps never animated any ſermon before——with peculiar malice and rancour againſt the clergy——delivered with ſo much ſpiritual pride, and in ſo contemptuous and dogmatical a ſtrain, as &c.* with much more of this natural Oratory, and decent reproof;

of

of all which, *the great and famous univerſity* was not aware, till this accurate obſerver found it out, and ſhewed it them; the reaſon of which he ſeems to hint at, when he tells us, that the doctor was *under the maſk of piety*, which the univerſity has ſo long thrown aſide, that they did not know it, when they ſaw it; and it is to be hoped they will out of gratitude beſtow ſome mark of honour upon Mr. Heathcote, for ſo kindly opening their eyes, and ſhewing them what bigotry, fanaticiſm, ignorance, uncommon bitterneſs of ſpirit, and more than ordinary malice, and rancour againſt the clergy, they have publickly ſet their hands to, by requeſting the publication of the ſermon.

The conteſt is, whether Reaſon muſt ſubmit to Revelation, or Revelation to Reaſon.

Mr. Heathcote tells us, p. 81.

" That the Chriſtian Religion has ſcarce ever *from its firſt inſtitution, down to theſe days of ours*, been rightly underſtood, or embraced in its purity."

The reaſon of which amazing *event*, as he calls it, is *its not having been explained on natural Religion, or the principles of common ſenſe.* This method which he would recommend is by his own confeſſion, a *novel one*; unknown to the Chriſtian world, from the *firſt inſtitution of our Religion, down to theſe days of ours.* A moſt *amazing thing*, that the only right way of explaining the Chriſtian Religion ſhould be unknown, from the firſt inſtitution of it. A hor-

rible impeachment this, of the ſenſe and underſtanding of the church of God, and its clergy, which this zealous advocate for the clergy brings againſt them; that down to theſe days of ours, they have *not rightly underſtood the Religion they profeſſed, ar embraced it, in its purity.* He thinks it ſafer, I ſuppoſe, to kick the dead lion in the face, than the living aſs. To inſult the venerable fathers, the lights of the early ages of the church; and the learned, pious, and judicious reformers, the lights of our times, than venture to cenſure a Clarke, or a Newton, as ſtrangers to the deſign of Revelation; and to nature and philoſophy.

He next proceeds to give an account of, "a new ſpecies of divines, who pretend to underſtand Chriſtianity, far better than all who are gone before them——" who all, according to this Author, *did not rightly underſtand it, or embrace it, in its purity*; and therefore it was high time for a new ſpecies of divines to ariſe. This new ſpecies of divines are oppoſed by another new ſpecies, ſuch as our Author. The one ſet up *the Scriptures*, the other *reaſon*, as the *teſt* and *foundation* of all knowledge; and the latter pretend to give the world a ſyſtem of principles, founded upon *demonſtration*, that comprehends the knowledge of God, his manner of exiſtence, attributes; and of his will with regard to us, and of our duty towards him. And they claim a right to try *the word of God* by theſe, which they call *natural notions*; and reject all, or any part of it, that ſhall not

not ſquare with their own fanſies, which they call *reaſon*, and ſuppoſe infallibly right in each of them; and which they make as high pretenſions to, and magnify as much, as the Quakers do *their light within*; and with as much juſtice.

The Author before us confounds ſeveral different points together, through his libel; namely, the bringing Revelation to the teſt of reaſon, and ſearching and examining into the ſenſe of Scripture. A right to examine the credentials of a Prophet, Moſes ſuppoſe, with a claim of right to *try* what he ſays, whether it be right or wrong; before we examine into the truth of his commiſſion; and ſeems to think there can be no *external evidence*, ſufficient to determine the divine authority of any perſon, who ſays, *God hath ſent him*; and accordingly ſets himſelf to invalidate the ſufficiency of that teſtimony, God from heaven gave to Moſes and the Prophets, Chriſt and his Apoſtles, in order to make way for his *natural light*, or *firſt Revelation*, as he calls, his natural notions.

He takes it for granted, that man has a power of finding out God, and ſeeing into the heavens of Jehovah, implanted in him; and talks of *inherent notions*, natural Religion, and the like, tho' rational objections have been made to this mad claim; and much has been written by Mr. H--n, and others, whom his adverſaries call Hutchinſonians, to ſhew that man has no ſuch power in him, and that he cannot *naturally* have any knowledge of God; nay far-

ther, that man would never arrive *naturally* at the knowledge of the works of God, which are what in general we call *nature*, and one would think might be *naturally* known; the contrary of which has been made appear by an induction of particulars, againſt Sir Iſaac Newton; and from the hiſtory of all mankind, who loſt the knowledge of the works of God, as ſoon as they loſt the knowledge and meaning of his *Revelation*.

The new ſpecies of divines, whoſe ſuppoſed pride, arrogance, and folly, Mr. Heathcote treads upon, like the Cynick on Plato's, with much greater, "diſdain, he ſays, the principles of *Plato*, thoſe of *Ariſtotle* likewiſe;"

which tho' he approves of, ſtands at the head of his charge againſt them. And he adds:

"Still moſt of all, thoſe of plain common ſenſe," which is calling *fool*, in pretty groſs language. And if it is not true, will prove him that, or worſe. He tells his reader further, that *they build on a very deep and recondite foundation,—Etymological evidence, as they call it.* That learned, candid, and modeſt writer, the Rev. the Provoſt of Oriel, hath ſaid more in his Preface *to the Chriſtian Plan*, in defence of this ſpecies of evidence, than this gentleman can ſet aſide; but what is cited from the doctor, as repreſenting it *by far the beſt key for explaining the mediatorial ſcheme, and doctrines of Chriſtianity*, is a falſe quotation, like ſome others to be met with, in Mr. *Heathcote*, and other Anti-

Hutchin-

Hutchinſonian writers; which can be owing to nothing but the great animoſity, and undue prejudice, conceived againſt the *H--ns*. What Dr. *Hodges* ſays, is Preface, p. 5.

" If this method of enquiry—was purſued under proper rules of inveſtigation, diſcreetly applied, *great helps*, I am confident, might be had from it, in explaining the mediatorial ſcheme, and the doctrines of Chriſtianity; ſince the choiſeſt treaſures of wiſdom and knowledge, lie hid in the firſt names of men and things."

This is not calling it *the beſt key*; *the real grounds and evidence of all Religion*, as charged, p. 82, 83. And one would think, that *if God hath himſelf given names*, as Dr. Hodges argues, Preface, p. 8. *Aſſigning the reaſon in their Etymology*—ridicule [of ſuch Etymologies] *would ſurely be a dangerous experiment, if not a ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt*. Every Chriſtian muſt ſubſcribe to this. But here, inſtead of ſhewing the weakneſs, uncertainty, or fallacy of this kind of evidence, ſo copious in the *old* T, and ſo often argued from, in the *new*; or ſhewing that the doctor or others have inferred wrongly from any Etymology; our Author attacks the very foundation, which the church of England does indeed build upon, viz. *Revelation*; and laughs at our ſaying *it is written* as deciſive evidence. See his note, p. 83.

" They firſt take the Revelation for granted, and then anſwer all objections, by the ſtrength of a divine authority—."

And is not the divine authority ſtrong enough for a man of reaſon? Can they go further, or ſhelter under a ſtronger rock? He goes on,

" — If *we* aſk how they know theſe names [of the Old Teſtament] to be of divine original, which ſurely is a reaſonable queſtion.—

What, from a Chriſtian Divine, a Preacher in the church of England? is it reaſonable for him to aſk another Divine, in a diſpute about the meaning of Scripture, for a proof that it is the word of God? If this be Mr. Heathcote's *reaſon and plain common-ſenſe*, let me continue the fool I am — " They content themſelves with affirming, that *it is written.*"

The prince of reaſoners did not diſpute this argument with Chriſt; when He anſwered, *it is written*, it ſilenced the Devil. The Scribes and Phariſees ſubmitted to it: And even the Mahometans acknowledge the inſpiration of Moſes and the Prophets. And is not this aſſiſtant preacher before ſo learned a body of Chriſtians as that of Lincoln's-Inn, is he not ſatisfied yet with the divinity of the Old and New Teſtament, and that what *is written* as coming from God muſt be right.

" It is their buſineſs to prove it," he ſays. Againſt whom are they to prove it? not againſt Jews, nor Chriſtians, in *explaining the mediatorial ſcheme*, from etymologies; both acknowledge it; and *ex confeſſo*, join iſſue upon it, when they argue from the *original words* of the *Hebrew Scriptures*. Who doth this Gentleman mean by *we*? " Yet if *we* [ſays he in Italicks] aſk

aſk how they know theſe names to be of divine original;"

We Infidels, Deiſts, and Atheiſts does he mean? He can't mean *we Chriſtians.* No man of common ſenſe, when he is diſputing about the etymology of a name in the Old Teſtament, ſtands to aſk for a proof of its divine original. A lawyer at the bar might as well be called upon to prove the authority of the laws of the land. Their authority is the foundation they argue upon, and ſo is the authority of the Old Teſtament betwixt thoſe who diſpute about the mediatorial ſcheme from the ſenſe and meaning of Scripture. Both parties are ſuppoſed to be convinced of the truth of it.

But ſuppoſe Mr. Heathcote only to perſonate an infidel, not in diſpute, but one, to whom this argument ſhould be uſed; he replies, you argue with me from the meaning of ſuch a name or etymology, which is, as you ſay, a ſentence in a ſingle word; and I grant, that according to the rules of the language, *Emanuel,* e. g. ſays, *God ſhould be with him*; but pray, Sir, how do you prove the authority of the writing you appeal to? How do you know your Bible is of divine original? I would anſwer, the extraordinary and miraculous hiſtory recorded in it, is, (if *real hiſtory)* a proof it came from God: and its reception by a whole nation, and the general acknowledgment of its truth by enemies, a full proof that the miracles it records were really performed. It is impoſſible

poſſible, that any people ſhould receive ſuch a hiſtory as *true*, had it not really been ſo. There is not an inſtance in the whole world beſide of ſuch a credulity, nor can be. It would be a greater miracle than any recorded there. The Bible muſt, as it ſays it does, in every page, come from God, or be a forged book. If you ſay it is forged, and the whole hiſtory of the Jews with it, be ſo good as to tell us, *when*, *where*, and *by whom* this forgery was put upon the world? And I beg leave to put the ſame, or the like queſtions to Mr. Heathcote, as he ſeems not rightly ſatisfied about the divine original of his Bible; or at leaſt with that evidence for it, the Chriſtian world has hitherto reſted their faith in it upon; and let him tell us, who forged the ſtory of God's coming down in perſon to Moſes, on mount Sinai, in a whirlwind, in fire, in a cloud, with power, majeſty, and great glory, and ſpeaking in the hearing of ſeveral millions of people, by his own voice? Exod. xix. 9. "The Lord ſaid to Moſes, lo, I come unto thee, in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I ſpeak unto thee, *and believe thee for ever.*" God thought this ſufficient evidence for Moſes, *for ever*; and ſo did the people. They ſaid to Moſes, "Behold the Lord our God has ſhewn us his glory and his greatneſs, and we have heard his voice, out of the midſt of the Fire. —Go thou near and hear all that the Lord our God ſhall ſay, and we will hear it and do it." And though an arch-infidel called this

Moſes's

Moſes's ſingle teſtimony, here were ſeveral millions, who have ſet their hands and ſeals to the truth of it, by receiving the written account, and their daily reading of it, in public and private. So that the book muſt be forged, and the whole hiſtory of the Jews with it; or here is undeniable evidence, external proof not to be diſputed, that the *law* was from God. Who forged the ſtory of the Jewiſh polity, civil and eccleſiaſtical, founded upon the authority of this appearance of God in perſon? of the ſtanding order of prophets? the continued repetition of miracles, as a continued proof of their divine commiſſion? the reception of their writings, upon that authority, and ſo the truth and certainty of the hiſtory, whence we are aſſured that God was with them indeed?

But it is not the certainty and ſufficiency of the external evidence ſo much before us now, as whether Reaſon be a proper teſt of Revelation, [not confounding here, as our adverſaries do, the ſearching of Scripture for its meaning, with a right to determine the truth of that meaning by our Reaſon, or according to our own judgment.] How extremely ridiculous, as well as rebellious, would it be, to argue for or againſt the authority of the laws of the land, upon the principles of *nature*, *reaſon*, and *common ſenſe*. The Parliament would ſoon tell us whoſe *Reaſon* ſhould *judge*, that of the lawgivers or the ſubjects; and whether their *acts* were theirs, and worthy of them. But when man, blind man, ſhall preſume to ſay, he will

receive

receive nothing, as worthy of God, which his reaſon doth not approve of, and which he doth not know *by nature*, and *beforehand*, to be true; it is a preſumption of the higheſt and moſt daring kind. It is making the wiſdom of God ſubmit to his ignorance, and denying his authority as a Lawgiver over him. If the Bible came from God, it muſt be right and true; for God cannot lie. Surely this ſounds to common ſenſe, that God can neither deceive nor be deceived. And therefore the firſt queſtion is, whether it be from God or no; and this muſt be determined by external evidence; it being too preſumptuous for fallible man to bring the infallible wiſdom of God to the teſt of his former notions, or his own private opinion.

But how ſhall we know, ſays the Deiſt, that there is a God, if not from reaſon, and by natural light? from reaſon and nature, we cannot know him, becauſe our ideas are not innate. God is not the object of our ſenſes; and nothing, but what is ſo, can *naturally* come into our mind. I would refer Mr. Heathcote to a moſt excellent Sermon of Mr. Willat's, on Rom. ii. 14. 15. lately republiſhed; which when this Gentleman, or any body elſe, hath confuted, I ſhall readily give up what I have written upon the ſubject.

But Mr. Heathcote offers ſomething, in ſupport of this preſumptuous claim, which bids defiance to the *wiſdom* and *authority* of God, though he has not thought proper to make any reply to the objections and reaſonings of Mr. H—n

H—n and others, againſt the divinity of this idol, which is ſet up in oppoſition to the living God, and tends as naturally to alienate the minds of its beſotted worſhippers from the love and fear of God, and to lead men from the knowledge of him, as the idols of *Babel* did formerly.

What Mr. Heathcote offers in ſupport of this idol is p. 26. et ſeq. He begins with telling us:

" It is certain, that in order to know and embrace a Revelation, we muſt previouſly be endued with *powers, which are capable of underſtanding* what it ſets forth——" where, we may gueſs, he means that men muſt be capable of underſtanding; or that a creature muſt have reaſon and common ſenſe, before he can be taught Religion: not that the *powers are capable of underſtanding*; *Reaſon* certainly is neceſſary; and this, I believe, no body will deny, or *hath denied:* but the point is, whether it would be of any uſe to us in religion, without Revelation. Reaſon is neceſſary, and ſo is a teachable diſpoſition, humility of mind, and a deſire of learning, which the *natural man* cannot have. He wants no teaching. He has the *powers that underſtand*, in himſelf. He has a previous knowledge of every thing you can teach him; ſo ſays Mr. Heathcote;

" Thus if Revelation treateth of matters which relate to the being of a God, and to his juſtice and goodneſs, I *muſt previouſly know*, that ſuch a Being exiſts, and have ideas alſo of the attributes

attributes of juſt and good," p. 27. which he cannot learn from the directions of God, as a *perfect leſſon* of what is *juſt* and *good*; but muſt gueſs at them, out of his own head; what God ſays is juſt and good, and by his word commands to be done as ſuch, not being ſo ſafe a guide in the enquiry, as our own underſtandings. I will paſs by the ſtrange perplexity and confuſed expreſſions, that run through the performance before us; ſuch as that above, *of the powers in* us *underſtanding*; *natural religion diſcovering revealed*, which is a contradiction in terms, p. 4. and here, *matters relating* to *the being of a God*, inſtead of *the being of a God*. We will paſs this and drive at his general meaning.

"*We muſt previouſly know that there is a God before we can learn it from Revelation.*" But why ſo? The deſign of Revelation is to teach us, that there is a God, who created and formed this ſyſtem; and it begins with that article of Religion. But we muſt know, what the words *God*, *create*, and ſo forth, mean, before we can underſtand that firſt propoſition, *God created the heavens and the earth*. Moſt certainly.—But where ſhall we get that meaning? Why, from our parents and inſtructors, who had it from theirs, and they from theirs, till you come up to inſpired men, to the firſt man, if you will, who had it from God himſelf. Who *converſed in perſon* with him, and taught him as people are taught now, by degrees, not what he knew before, which would have been only

loſt

loſt labour and uſeleſs pains, but what he did not know before, and *could not otherwiſe have known*. How are children taught now? what they knew before, or what they did not? We teach them that there is a God; explain his attributes to them, as they grow up, and become more capable of being inſtructed; as they have gathered more and more ideas, by the exerciſe of their ſenſes, for they can have none otherwiſe. Ideas come *ab extra*; do not grow in the mind, and are not ideas of *God* or *Spirit*, but of matter; and man could never have looked further, without *ſupernatural* help. And nothing can be more a miſtake than arguing, *we muſt previouſly know there is a God, and have ideas of his attributes*, before we can be taught that he exiſts, and in what manner; we muſt have common ſenſe; and that properly exerciſed upon the *things of nature*, before we can underſtand the *things of God*; and God himſelf muſt point out which reſemble which; becauſe man cannot compare two things together, one of which he doth not ſee. And as to what is *juſt* and *good*, I ſay, God only is the proper judge of what is *juſt* and *good*; and what he tells us *is* ſo, our common ſenſe will tell us *muſt* be ſo; and if Mr. Heathcote's common ſenſe doth not tell him the ſame, I don't envy him the ſhare he has of it. God appears to Adam, converſes with him, inſtructs him in the nature of every thing around him, points to *the things that are made*, by which *the things of God could become intelligible to him*. God knew

what

what things here reſembled the things above, and he only could know; what more previous knowledge did *Adam* ſtand in need of, than children have, when we begin to teach them? and yet they arrive in time, as Mr. Heathcote aſſerts he has, to a ſufficient knowledge of the divinity and its attributes, without previouſly knowing them; unleſs he will ſay, he knows no more now, than he did, when he firſt began to be taught; and if he doth not, it is high time he went to ſchool again.

Suppoſe we apply this aſſertion to any other ſcience. Philoſophy, E. G. Revelation treats of the matter of the heavens; and of the Orbs in them: of the expanſive power of the heavens, and its conſequences. Will it be ſaid to be neceſſary we ſhould have the *previous* knowledge of all this, before we can be taught it? Revelation has explained this intereſting part of knowledge to us; and our Philoſophers, ever ſince they have left their Bible, have been ignorant of it; as thoſe divines muſt be of God, the firſt cauſe, who leave his Revelation, and dream out of their own heads what manner of perſon he is. *Philoſophy* muſt be learnt, without ſuch a previous knowledge, as this gentleman talks of, as neceſſary in divinity, or it can never be learnt; for our *naturaliſts* have no ſuch previous knowledge at preſent. All, in good truth, the gentleman ſhould mean here, is, that a perſon muſt be a rational intelligent being, before he can be taught; or muſt naturally have a capacity to learn. But previouſly knowing what

you

you are to be taught, is in itſelf impoſſible; and if it were not, renders teaching unneceſſary; and the imagination of being poſſeſſed of ſuch a fund of previous knowledge, renders teaching *impracticable* alſo, by poſſeſſing the mind with a notion of its own ſufficiency. And indeed, why ſhould a man ſtoop to be taught what he knew before? And thus we ſee your *natural Enthuſiaſt* will not ſtoop to be taught, even by God himſelf; as in that grand and firſt point of Religion, *Unity* in *Trinity*. He perſuades himſelf, that nature teaches him there is one perſon, and therefore he will not hear God, who tells him, there are three in the eternal eſſence. And ſo in every other inſtance, where his reaſon *demonſtrates* one thing, and his Bible another; he rejects it as a *Revelation*, contrary to the teſtimony of our ſenſes, which aſſure us it came from God; I ſay, *contrary to the evidence of our ſenſes*; for what ſo many millions of people heard God ſpeak, and ſaw him deliver in writing to Moſes, may juſtly be ſaid to have the *evidence* of *our ſenſes*, for its divine authority. This the *reaſoner* rejects, becauſe in ſome reſpects, inconſiſtent with ſome deduction from ſuch *premiſſes*, as he has perſuaded himſelf into the truth and certainty of. Nay, what is more abſurd, and inconſiſtent with itſelf, he ſhall receive one part of Revelation, as ſuch; and reject others, becauſe he doth not, or pretends he does not, ſee the propriety, truth, and juſtice of them. The firſt deception here, is that every man's *reaſon* is right; [and

this every man flatters himſelf into, as to his own particular;] becauſe *reaſon in general* is right. That is, becauſe truth is truth, what I think to be truth, is ſo. But man is fallible; and may deceive himſelf, in reaſoning even upon revealed premiſſes or data; but *naturally* we have no *data* to reaſon upon, with regard to *ſpiritual objects*. And it is another deception, to build upon *general notions*; which, but for *traditionary Revelation*, the heathen world never would have had; and which our modern heathens at home, have gathered in an imperfect manner, from the *written word:* But the moſt preſumptuous and daring impiety of all, is to pretend to a right of *trying*, that which we know to be the word of God, by our own judgement; and and when this is urged, under the pretence of *ſearching* and *examining* it, it is as weak as it is ſophiſtical. Becauſe it is neceſſary we ſhould underſtand what we read, and believe, to ſay we have a right to reject, what we do not approve of, is ſo ill-grounded an inference, that he who deſignedly or undeſignedly makes it, is not fitter to be truſted with a ſyllogiſm, than a child with a knife, or a madman with a ſword. The miſtake is childiſh, the conſequence dreadful; it is madneſs in the higheſt degree, and has already turned the feet of thouſands from the path of everlaſting light, into the road that leads down to the chambers of death, and darkneſs. We ſee what a deplorable condition the heathen world lay in, when the light of Revelation was extinguiſhed, by the miſts and damps

of

of *imagination*, alias, *reaſoning from nature*, without the guide of revealed truths. But Mr. *Heathcote*'s *natural notions*, like *Chillingworth*'s *Religion*, only wanted purifying, when *Chriſtianity was promulgated*, p. 29. *They were corrupted, and deformed by philoſophy and ſuperſtition.* If ſo, he has made an ugly miſtake; and ſhould have ſet up *Revelation*, as the *teſt* of his *natural notions*; and not his notions of Revelation. It was Chriſtianity that purified the notions of the world, of the falſe philoſophy and ſuperſtition, that had ſpread ſo dirty a face over them. And if he pretend to ſet up his *notions* above Revelation, will ſoon get himſelf into the ſame dirty pickle he was in before. It is the living water muſt waſh the face of the man of God.

But next, Revelation is urged to be its own executioner, and brought forth to accuſe itſelf of impertinently offering that information, which we can have *to demonſtration* without it. It confirms, Mr. Heathcote ſays, his account of *natural Religion*, which he defines, p. 29, 30, "To be the dictates of common ſenſe; or the informations we receive *from* our natural powers, *in all matters of duty relating to God and man*; and it includes, he ſays, a knowledge of God's exiſtence, &c."

But our natural powers can give us no information about God's exiſtence. That he might have ſeen proved by Mr. H—n, in a piece of his, he has cited once or twice; profeſſedly by Mr. Dove, in his *Creed, founded on truth, and common ſenſe*; and his *Eſſay on Inſpiration*. Books

that will ſtand the teſt of reaſon, and common ſenſe. But we muſt follow Mr. Heathcote, in his own way. He ſays:

" Nothing can be plainer, than that Revelation doth not any where inculcate theſe principles, as if mankind were unacquainted with them before."

This is not true, nor would his inference follow, were it ſo. *Mankind* is Jew and Gentile. The latter had loſt the knowledge of God. And the Scripture no where ſuppoſes the being, and attributes of God to be known to them; but every where ſpeaks of them, as without God in the world, as ſtrangers to him; as not having the knowledge of his name. *Who is Jehovah*, ſays *Pharoah*, *I know not Jehovah.* It is an aſſertion, that contradicts the whole tenor of Scripture: and had not this gentleman cited in the moſt wretched mangled manner, the paſſage from Rom. 1. which he does, p. 30. that very paſſage aſſerts the direct contrary, of what he brings it for. v. 19, 20. " That which may be known of God, is manifeſt *to* them; for God *ſhewed* it to them." Not reaſon, nature, fanſy, or imagination; but God ſhewed it unto them. Ογαρ Θεος αυτοις εφανερωσε. And the Apoſtle tells you in the next words, as Moſes does, that God gave a revelation of himſelf, and his will, at the very firſt; and that the inviſible things of God were ſeen, by being made intelligible by the things that are made: all our knowledge of God being *analogical.* And here is a poſitive aſſertion, that God

God himſelf *revealed* to the heathen world, what they once knew of him; but that *profeſſing themſelves to be wiſe they became fools.* From the very ſame preſumptuous claim, this Gentleman makes himſelf, and would have others make, *a right to reaſon*, where their buſineſs was *to hear and obey. They became fooliſh*, ſays the apoſtle, *by their reaſonings*, Διαλογισμοις, *ratiocinationibus*, ſays Pagnine; our Engliſh, very juſtly, *by their imaginations.* By this were they led aſtray from the true God, and into all the abominations in faith and practice, which had ſo defaced the world, when Chriſt came, that it had loſt not only what was *divine*, but almoſt all that was *human* in our nature; and this preſumptuous and crying inſolence will ſend us back again into the ſame dreadful gulph the *Word of God* raiſed us out of. Becauſe our anceſtors fell into *reaſonings*, firſt *without*, then *againſt*, his revealed word, God gave them up to every thing that could make them ſenſible of their wickedneſs in departing from the living God; and which was a juſt vengeance upon them for doing ſo.

Revelation was given to Adam, who taught it his Children, and they theirs; and when all fleſh had corrupted its way before God, he ſwept them away by the deluge; and by Noah renewed the race of men and face of Religion. And when all fleſh almoſt had again corrupted the way of God, all in a manner but the ſeed of Jacob; and they and their religion were in the utmoſt danger of being ſwallowed up in

Egyptian darkneſs and confuſion, God again interpoſes in the moſt public, ſolemn, and awful manner; reinſtituted the law and all its ceremonies, with the records, *hieroglyphical* and *verbal*; wrote them in *letters*, and by a conſtant ſtanding church-ſervice, on the celebration of which depended their very exiſtence, as a nation, held forth the *light of the Goſpel* to all the world. So that Revelation ſpeaks not to the Iſraelites, as ſtrangers to the knowledge of God, which they had from their anceſtors. They had a *previous knowledge* of God; but not from *themſelves*, but from their religion which came down to them, with their blood, from Adam. In revealing himſelf to Adam, God revealed himſelf to all the ſons of Adam, as well as to that line, whence Noah deſcended; and in revealing himſelf to Noah, he revealed himſelf to all the families of Noah, as well as to that of Shem, and to all the families of Shem, as well as to that of Abraham, and to all the families of Abraham as well as to that of Jacob; and all might have continued to worſhip him, as well as Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob; and all the tribes of Jacob might have continued to do ſo, till Chriſt came, as well as that of Judah. But *when they knew God, they glorified him not as God*, but *became vain in their imaginations*, or reaſonings. God *hath ſaid ſo*; and *It is written*; and *The divine authority* became the ſubject of contempt and ridicule, as it is now [God avert the wrath that hangs over ſuch wicked defiance] with Mr. Heathcote. They muſt *demonſtrate* for them-

themſelves; God's ſpeaking, though in perſon, would not do with them. Let a man read the firſt chapter to the *Romans*, and conſider the dreadful end this preſumptuous claim naturally leads to; and he may ſee that the reaſoner without *revealed data*, is the worſt ſubject, and the greateſt enemy, a king or people can have.

This [Rom. i. 20.] is the only text Mr. Heathcote has produced, and it is point blank againſt him; and ſo is the whole tenor of Scripture. "What man," ſays St. Paul, "knoweth the things of a man, ſave the ſpirit of a man which is in him? even ſo the things of God knoweth *no one* but the ſpirit of God." 1 Cor. ii. 11. and v. 13. "We ſpeak not in words, which *man's wiſdom* teacheth, but which the *Holy Ghoſt* teacheth." Mr. Heathcote is more orthodox. *The Apoſtle is an enthuſiaſt; an enemy to reaſon and the powers thereof; he ſtifles and extinguiſhes our common notions of things, and cries out, It is written*, and *refers all to a divine authority*. Nay, he goeth further, which they, whoſe fooliſh heart is not too far darkened, with following the *ignis fatuus* of their own imaginations, would do well to conſider; and ſays, "the natural man receiveth not the things of the ſpirit of God; for they are fooliſhneſs unto him, *neither can he know them*."

Nor are the notions of right and wrong inherent in us; neither does the Scripture ſay or ſuppoſe any ſuch thing. But ſays our natural man,

" St. Paul, without attempting to explain, is only ſollicitous to enforce, *whatſoever things are true, whatſoever things are honeſt*," &c.

But does St. Paul ſpeak to them that were without God and his word, or to thoſe who had received the Scriptures with the faith of Chriſt? He immediatly adds, *thoſe things which ye have both learned and received, and heard and ſeen in me, do.* They had *learned and received them*, and *heard* and ſeen them in the apoſtle; not as *inherent* in themſelves. What ſpirit muſt we call this in Mr. Heathcote, that cites Scripture in this barefaced manner againſt itſelf, and againſt the context?

The next argument, p. 31. is a flat contradiction to his whole pamphlet and the avowed deſign of it. " Man," he allows, " fell from from his original ſtate of perfection; ſays, God was pleaſed to reſtore his *natural notions* to *their original purity* [words he has no diſtinct meaning to], by ſeveral ſucceſſive revelations, from Adam to Chriſt. Theſe, p. 32. *are the grounds of Revelation*:" and conſequently, not *reaſon* nor *nature*. This Gentleman, *in his excurſions among Chriſtians*, has picked up ſome notions of the original revelation to Adam; and the occaſional intercourſes of God with believers from Adam down to Moſes; and acknowledges here, in direct contradiction to his whole undertaking, that that revealed knowledge is what is contained in the Old and New Teſtament; and that our *natural notions muſt be reſtored*, if ever they are reſtored,

to

to their original purity, by thoſe *ſucceſſive revelations*,

" as they are explained and ſet forth, in the books of the Old and New Teſtament;"

Conſequently, that they are our rule and guide; the teſt of our reaſon; and ſtandard by which we are to judge of what is right and wrong. *To reſtore*, he calls it, *our natural notions to their original purity*, i. e. which are to teach us true and juſt notions.

And in the next page he almoſt forces himſelf into a further confeſſion, that it is not the *uſe*, but the *abuſe* of reaſon, the *new faſhioned divinity* of this age, [as he would have learning from Scripture be thought] he complains of. Chriſt *did not pretend*, he ſays, *to give ſight to men who wanted eyes*. But he came to enable men to uſe their eyes aright, and to give them *that light*, which muſt come from God, not nature, by which the ſoul ſhall be enabled to diſcern ſpiritual things, which the natutal man cannot know. This man of reaſon ſeems to ſee the abſurdity of ſuppoſing the *light, by which the eye ſees, to be in itſelf*. The eye has a capacity of receiving the light; but the light, any more than the idea of the object we ſee, is not *inherent* in the eye. The natural light is that by which the eye of the body ſees; and the light of Revelation, that which the eye of the mind ſees by; and the miſtake, which runs through this whole performance, and ſeveral other abuſive pieces againſt the H———ns, and which has inflamed the paſſions of their adverſaries

ſaries ſo much, is ſuppoſing the eye can ſee without light, by a power inherent in itſelf. The ſoul can ſee nothing [of itſelf,] but what the eye of the body ſees; and the eye can ſee nothing, but what is corporeal or *natural*; and what is *natural* is not *ſpiritual.*

He ſays right, Chriſt did not come *to give ſight to men, who wanted eyes*; but he came to give light to ſuch as were born blind; and did do ſo to ſome, to give us a ſpecimen of his power. Man *naturally* is blind; or which is the ſame thing, cannot make uſe of his eyes, if the light do not ſhine from without upon him. The light he ſees by muſt come from the heavens of Jehovah; and the Old and New Teſtament both tell us, that Chriſt is *the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.* God converſed with Adam before his fall, and gave him new light afterwards. Chriſt is the way, the truth, and the life. He was always the object of the faith of the church of God, from Adam downwards, and always muſt be ſo, or elſe it will become the church of Satan.

The concluſion is, that *the new-faſhioned Divinity* is chargeable with the *abſurdity and contradiction* of *ſuppoſing that Chriſt came to inculcate ſupernatural truths, before there were any natural*; by which I ſuppoſe the angry Gentleman means, that we are ſo abſurd as to ſuppoſe that our religion was revealed from heaven, and that we could not *naturally* have come to the knowledge of it. If he means more, he charges

us

us falſely. If he means no more, there is no abſurdity in it; but a moſt important truth.

"VI. Secondly, I affirm, ſays Mr. Heathcote, that theſe natural notions, which have been often called, as in truth they are, God's *firſt Revelation* *, to mankind, muſt be the *primary guide and ultimate teſt* of every other Revelation," p. 33.

But *Revelation* muſt *purify its guide* firſt, waſh its face and open its eyes, [ſee the two laſt pages] it will have a blind guide, and a filthy dirty fellow to borrow purity from elſe. I *affirm*, ſays Mr. Heathcote, that *natural notions* muſt be the *primary guide*, and *ultimate teſt of every other Revelation*,. Mr. Heathcote affirms it; that is one argument. But why may not the ſecond Revelation be the teſt of the firſt pretended one, as well as the firſt of the ſecond? Moſes, ſuppoſe, and Mr. Heathcote are bringing each other's Revelation to the teſt; for our good friend pretends to inſpiration; and brings his natural notions, anglicè, a parcel of metaphyſical terms, and tells the Prophet, I am come to try whether your pretended Revelation be from God or no. I am ſure

* This abuſe of words is treacherous and deceitful, and deſigned to cover a fallacy. *Revelation* means what comes immediately and *ſupernaturally* from God; and here is made to ſignify what comes from ourſelves, or what we fancy of ourſelves to be true: ſuppoſe an upper ſervant in a great family ſhould take it in his head to call his own opinions his maſter's *directions*, and deliver them out as ſuch, would he not be a deceiver?

that

that I am *inſpired*, but I don't know whether you are or no. Had thoſe, who ſaw God come down in fire and glory, and heard him ſpeak to Moſes out of the whirlwind, in the preſence of the whole nation, had any of them been ſo preſumptuous as to queſtion the truth of it, would not hell itſelf, think we, inſtead of the earth, have opened to have ſwallowed them up alive? Was it poſſible for God to give greater evidence, or proof leſs liable to miſtake than a ſight of his own perſon, and the hearing of his own voice, to ſuch a number of witneſſes, of his commiſſion to Moſes? Suppoſe man to have a ſackful of *natural notions inherent in him*, as Mr. H——e words it, or hanging all over him, could he be more ſure that God ſpake, than hearing of him ſpeak, and ſeeing of him, made him? Will he, in this unmeaning cant language, bring what God ſays to him to the teſt of his natural notions? If Mr. Heathcote has ſuch a right, ſo had Moſes; and ſo had the children of Iſrael, who ſaw God and heard him ſpeak; for *theſe natural notions muſt be the primary guide, and ultimate teſt of every other Revelation.* If ſo, then Moſes and the children of Iſrael, had a right to try the truth of what God ſaid. The Reader will obſerve, that it is not uſing our Reaſon and Underſtanding to come at the meaning of what God ſays, this Gentleman is contending for, but that *his reaſon is the teſt and ſtandard of the truth and veracity of it*; and if this is not

blaſphemy

blaſphemy in the higheſt degree, what can be ſo? It ſuppoſes that what God ſays, *may not* be true. It is the firſt fallacy the devil put upon Eve—*to try the truth of what God ſays!* Can God utter a falſehood, or thoſe under his guidance miſtake, or miſrepreſent his meſſage? Would he ſend thoſe upon his errand, he knew would deceive the people in his name? That is impoſſible; wiſdom and goodneſs forbid the thought. But why do I argue againſt one who only affirms, and then proceeds to abuſe thoſe, who do not care to take his affirmation? Dr. Hodges, he ſays,

" *raves in a fanatic ſtrain*; and every ſober minded Chriſtian muſt needs be convinced, that ſuch an examination is highly reaſonable—that it is enjoined by the goſpel itſelf; and that *it is his duty to ſearch the Scriptures.*" p. 34.

Poor man, I was in hopes he did not know what he was talking about. It is our duty to ſearch the Scriptures, and not to be wiſe *above what is written.* And as our church, in a *raving fanatic ſtrains*, prays we may, *to read, learn, mark, and inwardly digeſt them*; David too raves in the ſame ſtrain, and calls them *the light of his feet*; food ſweeter than honey, and the honey-comb; and ſays, they were his conſtant ſtudy. But all this is not bringing them to the teſt of their reaſon, but their reaſon to the teſt of the Scriptures. If this gentleman means no more by *bringing the Scriptures to the teſt of his reaſon and natural notions*, than *ſearching* of *them*, who is he preaching againſt? The Hutchinſonians? No. They lay too great a ſtreſs, he

ſays,

ſays, upon the written word; and recommend the *ſearching* of it, as the ſole ſource and fountain of divine truths; and of the principal phyſical truths too. Here is either the moſt berefaced, palpable juggle; or the moſt childiſh blunder, an *inſpired man* ever fell into. When he is contending for *natural light, as the principal guide we have to truſt to; and natural notions as the only teſt of revealed truths*, he means all the while, ſearching and examining of the Scriptures; when he comes to prove the H–ns *raving fanatics*, for not preſuming to doubt the truth of what God ſays, under the ſilly fallacy of bringing it to the teſt of common ſenſe, or trying it by our own judgements; they are repreſented as forbidding the ſearching of S. S. as if they did not ſearch them, or diſcommended it. Is there no difference betwixt ſearching the Scriptures, and bringing them to the teſt of reaſon; that he puts them upon us as the ſame thing? If *deſignedly*, truth and juſtice oblige me to ſay, he is worſe than a madman, or fanatic either. If he did not ſee the difference, he is weaker than a child, inſtead of being furniſhed with abilities, to bring the word of God to the teſt, and weigh its worth in a balance. Mr. K—cott hath fal'n into the ſame miſtake, in *his word of advice*, and abuſes inſtead of adviſing, in much the ſame ſtrain; as do the Authors of the two *Reviews*.

But Mr. Heathcote expoſes the abſurdity of *the H–n Zealots*, p. 33. by caſting his eyes round the globe, upon the great variety of different

ferent Religions in it; which requires that we ſhould examine which is the true. And our church has examined, and he has ſubſcribed to their preference of the Chriſtian. If the reaſons it has given him for that preference, are not ſatisfactory, and ſufficient to determine him, let him lay aſide the gown, till he has examined farther. And what has or ought to determine him, I ſuppoſe he will think it reaſonable, for every ſincere impartial perſon to be determined by, and ſhould not treat Revelation, as not having been *ſatisfactorily* proved to be ſuch. But all the while he is confounding again two things, as different as black and white. Examining the evidence, by which *we diſtinguiſh true Religion from the falſe*, is not bringing it to the teſt of reaſon; there have been but three Religions in the world; Chriſtianity, which began with Adam; the worſhip of the heavens; and Mahometiſm; Chriſtianity was firſt; lays claim to a divine original, and ſays, it came from God. Idolatry diſowned any other God, than the *heavens*; and *Mahomet* gave his own word that God ſent him; and appealed to the ſucceſs of his ſword. Moſes ſays, God talked with him, face to face; and that the whole nation ſaw it. That he filled the earth with wonders, Egypt with plagues, the heavens with darkneſs, commanded the ſea, made its waters to ſtand on an heap, and executed judgements on all that was then called God, in oppoſition to Jehovah. The whole nation of Iſrael have ſubſcribed to Moſes's teſtimony,

mony, by their continued public and ſolemn reading of his writings, in their places of worſhip. Now can't we determine betwixt theſe ſeveral claims, without taking upon us to bring to the teſt of our reaſon, what appears evidently to be from God? And can't we argue the point without being abuſed for deſtroying reaſon, and denying them the liberty of ſearching, and examining what is *proved* to be Revelation? So much juggle, ſo much abuſe, and ſo much weakneſs, are no credit to *natural reaſon*, whoſe advocate this gentleman would be thought to be againſt the H–ns. Reaſon, I bleſs God for, and wiſh this gentleman and myſelf, had a greater ſhare of it, than we have. But if we had, it is eaſy to ſee by ſome late great men, what it leads to, when we preſume to bring the contents of a Revelation to the teſt of reaſon; reaſon we cannot about Religion, without the revealed *data*. And they, who attempt it, always have, and always will, fall into the ſnares of the great deceiver. To what is the dreadful ſpread of Arianiſm, Deiſm, and Atheiſm, owing, but to that fatal miſtake, of ſetting up reaſon for *inſtructor*, where it can only be *ſcholar*. It is the ſuggeſtion of the devil, that reaſon can *teach*; and it is as weak, as it is pernitious; when it is ſo apparent, it can only be *taught*, with regard to the things of God, and all ſpiritual objects.

But ſays, Mr. Heathcote,

" VII. p. 40. When I have laid the ground work, and have diſcovered, that it may be a Reve-

Revelation—I then proceed to try, whether it actually is ſo, by inquiring—into its external evidence."

What a deal of trouble, danger, and preſumptuous madneſs would be ſaved in examining, firſt, whether it is ſo, or no, by enquiring into its vouchers? If a book that ſays it came from God, as the Bible does in almoſt every page, cannot be ſupported by *external evidence*; it is not its being *conformable*, or not in any reſpect *contradictory*, to reaſon, that can eſtabliſh its authority *as the word of God*; and if its Author fairly appears to have been commiſſioned from heaven, a man muſt be more hardened than the devil himſelf, to doubt of its reaſonableneſs; or preſume to ſit as *judge* over it. Mr. Heathcote can ſupport, he ſays, his manner of proceeding by the authority, and example of the ableſt and moſt orthodox divines; if he can, I am ſorry for it. He has not yet done it: many of them [*lately*] talk of natural Religion indeed, but guard againſt the conſequences he runs into; Dr. Thomas Manningham, in a ſermon before the houſe of Commons, Nov. 5, 1692, after talking about natural Religion, as ſome others have done ſince, ſays, "All the uſe we have of reaſon, in the matter of Religion, is to lead us to divine Revelation; and then to aſſiſt us in finding out the true ſenſe, and meaning of what is there delivered; and when this is done, we are wholly to reſign ourſelves to the will of God, and to believe and

do as he has commanded;" and this is the language of our divines in general.

But ſuppoſe otherwiſe, upon his own principles, he can't expect that their example and authority ſhould weigh with us, till he has proved it *reaſonable*; we ſhall therefore wave their authority till he has done ſo. And let him ever remember, that precluding *reaſon* from being the teſt of Revelation, is not precluding the *uſe of Reaſon*, as he ſo often tells us; and for which indeed he has the authority and example of ſeveral, that think themſelves *able, and orthodox divines*, as may be ſeen in ſome late apologies, and other anonymous puffs. All the defence Mr. Heathcote makes for the blaſphemous claim of bringing Scripture to the teſt of reaſon; or trying the Revelation we have from God, by [in his language] the Revelation we have in and from ourſelves, is confounding the ſearching into the ſenſe, and after the evidence of Scripture, with a claim of fitting judge over that ſenſe, when we have found it out: propoſitions of a quite different nature, and which are put perpetually upon the reader for one another. The firſt, the H—ns never forbid, it is down right ſlander to charge them with it; as to the ſecond, we ſay that reaſon is no teſt, whether an act of Parliament be an act of Parliament, or no. We determine that by its external evidence, and the reaſon is plain, neither the *reaſon* nor *authority* of Parliament, can in honour or prudence ſubmit themſelves to our opinion. And muſt the authority and wiſdom

of

of God ſubmit themſelves to our opinion? Mr. H–e cites *Lactantius*, p. 36. that " in the ſearch after truth, every man muſt depend upon himſelf, and his own judgement; God having given us a capacity to find out truth." This is pleading, for what we call the *right of private judgement*; but by no means, as cited, that *reaſon is to be the judge* of *Revelation*. What he ſays, is, that we ſhould enquire into the *inventa majorum*; and examine what evidence they had, for what they have tranſmitted down to us. But when he ſpeaks of Revelation, Lib. 3. §. 1. He refers all to the authority of the Prophets, and ſays, as every man of common ſenſe muſt, " nec enim decebat––ut cum deus ad hominem loqueretur, *argumentis aſſereret ſuas voces*, tanquam ei fides non haberetur: ſed ut oportuit eſt locutus, *quaſi rerum omnium maximus judex*; *cujus eſt, non argumentari*, ſed pronuntiare verum. Ipſe ut deus: nos autem, cum ad res ſingulas teſtimonia divinæ vocis habeamus, profecto monſtravimus quanto certioribus argumentis poſſint vera defendi, cum &c."

This good man raves like Dr. Hodges, and the H–ns, and as our pious reformers did before them, and preacheth up the implicit obedience due to Revelation, as having the *teſtimonia divinæ vocis*. And little thought, as repreſented, of ſetting up *private judgement* againſt the word of God, or over it; tho' he ſo ſtrenuouſly urges it againſt all human authority, to the *ſhame and confuſion* of *ſuch Proteſtants*, as our Author, [to borrow his words,] who think

they have a right to diſpute with God, becauſe they have with man.

But in truth, all this noiſe about *natural notions*, and common ſenſe, is meer affected cant: Mr. H–n has ſhewn, that *nature* is on the ſide of the *Bible*; and has from objects of ſenſe, given *ſenſible ideas* of a *Trinity in Unity*; for which the Arians, Socinians, and Deiſts, will *never forgive him, nor ſpare his memory, or readers.* And let me obſerve further, that by *natural notions*, they mean the *metaphyſical entia rationis:* they have no *natural notions*; they do not underſtand *nature*, and its mechaniſm. They are ſtrangers to the *triune* power of the air, which the Heathens worſhipped as God; and which ſome of them knew, by tradition, was only *ſimulachrum alicujus eterni.* And it is *metaphyſicks*, not *nature*, they ſet up as the teſt of Revelation, and judge over the word of God. This is what Mr. H–e does, and to this purpoſe endeavours to deſtroy the external evidence of Scripture, which I ſhould now proceed to, only muſt firſt obſerve, that our inſpired Author ſeems diſpoſed, p. 40. to compromiſe the matter in diſpute, and limit the authority of reaſon, over the *word of God.* It ſhall not now be its teſt, and ultimate Criterion, only have a title to look ſharp, whether,

" It *may* be a Revelation for any thing, that reaſon urges to the contrary."

If a man, for inſtance, ſhould bring you the hiſtory of Tom Thumb, or *ſomnium ſcipionis*, and tell you they were inſpired writings, you need

need not give yourſelf the trouble of enquiring, whether they were ſo or no; but venture, without any further ceremony, to put them to their proper uſe. And is this all the Gentleman has been contending for? Do, kind Reader, turn back, and ſee, for I am almoſt tired with the dirty road, and have a great deal farther to go in it. And is this all that is meant by *natural Revelation*, (ſee p. 33.) being

" The primary guide and ultimate teſt of every other Revelation?"

Why, truly, if it be, it is miſtaking the meaning of the moſt common words; and the moſt childiſh affair poſſible.——God gives Moſes the two tables in writing, with his own hands; was it neceſſary for Moſes to look whether he had not got two tomb-ſtone inſcriptions, before he received them as the word of God? He brings them to the people, as he did the whole law, after he had written it from the mouth of God. Muſt the people carefully peep over it, to ſee it was not ſome fooliſh romance he had brought them by miſtake, inſtead of the law? What leſs does this reſtriction of the Gentleman imply, than that, after they had ſeen God give Moſes the law and commandments, it was their buſineſs to be ſatisfied, *they might be a Revelation for any thing their reaſon could urge to the contrary*; *and when* they had diſcovered that it might, to receive them as having ſufficient external evidence, in that of their eyes and ears, of their coming from God; when, at the ſame time, if they had evidence of their coming

from God, their *coming from God* was ſufficient, one would think, to ſatisfy them that their Reaſon could have nothing to object to the contents: *For who art thou, O man, that diſputeſt with God?* is a queſtion that might be pertinently aſked upon ſuch an occaſion, but can never be anſwered in the affirmative. There nothing more weak and childiſh than ſuch ſalvos.

Our inſpired Author forgets, in his note in this page, [p. 40.] the *previous knowledge* he has laid ſo much ſtreſs upon; and that *natural notions* are the foundation, as well as teſt, of revealed truths; for here he allows "that there are *many particulars* in *revealed*, which make no part of *natural* Relgion; and which the pureſt and moſt improved Reaſon alone *could never have attained the leaſt conception of*."

Theſe *particulars* can be of no great conſequence to us, if Mr. Heathcote be in the right of it, that Reaſon is a ſufficient guide *in all matters of duty relative to God and man.* Nor can they be founded on *natural notions*, if the *pureſt and moſt improved Reaſon could never have attained the leaſt conception of them*; becauſe theſe natural notions are ſuppoſed to be inherent in every mind. What teſt have we of the truth of theſe many extraordinary particulars ſo remote from the province of Reaſon? May we here turn Hutchinſonians, and believe implicitly, becauſe *it is written?* or will the external evidence be *here* allowed ſufficient to determine the divine original of ſuch particulars?

If

If we receive ſome important particular, as *revealed*, without *natural notions* and a *previous knowledge* of them, upon the ſtrength of the external evidence, why might not *all* be received in the ſame manner, and upon the ſame footing? I doubt Mr. H——e has overſhot himſelf a little.

Your natural-religion men, who are in orders, commonly make ſuch conceſſions, to be conſiſtent with their profeſſion as preachers of the goſpel: but they are abſolutely inconſiſtent with their claims in behalf of unaſſiſted Reaſon, and their natural notions. The Scripturiſt and Deiſt are the ox and aſs, that ſhould not plow together. It is an inconſiſtent mixture, and the creatures are unequally yoked together. Either reaſon is not ſufficient *in all matter of duty relative to God and man*; or Revelation is unneceſſary. Either *natural notions* (in the deiſtical ſenſe of the words) are not the foundation and teſt of Revelation; or there are no particulars in Revelation, which reaſon could never have attained to the leaſt conception of. But Mr. Heathcote is ſo enamoured with his *Dulcinea*, that he will fight with mountains, and reaſon down rocks; nay, attempt to overturn all the ſtrong holds of Chriſtianity before he will remove his *Reaſoning* from him.

And, oh *Reaſoning!* what a ſpecimen have we of it in our Author's reaſoning againſt the evidence of miracles. I ſhall not examine it line by line; it does not deſerve it. It has burſt forth in the zeal of oppoſition,

and over-eagerneſs of diſpute, as other bad noiſes do upon a ſtrain. He ſays, 1. Miracles muſt be *poſſible*, muſt be ſtrongly atteſted, muſt be apparently reaſonable. Are thoſe related by Moſes, and thoſe of Chriſt and his apoſtles, poſſible, well atteſted, and reaſonable or no? He leaves us here, which he ſhould not have done; becauſe if they are ſo, then, according to himſelf, the *Bible is Revelation*; and may juſtly demand to be heard and obeyed *implicitly*; unleſs man can article with his Creator, how far he ſhall obey him.

Next, he ranks the miracles of Moſes and Chriſt with thoſe of Apollonius, and the *popiſh Legends*, and is *neither afraid nor aſhamed* to affirm, that the pretended *Pagan* and *Popiſh Miracles* are equally *credible* with thoſe recorded in Scripture.

[" The authority of a *Philoſtratus* or a *Barnard* becomes of equal weight with the authority of an Evangeliſt or an Apoſtle."]

As to *hiſtoric teſtimony*, p. 43. and 44. he ſays,

" So, were we to deſcend from Pagan to Popiſh legends, we ſhall find *innumerable miracles*, as ſtrongly affirmed, and *as well atteſted*, as any matters of fact can be."

To all which I ſhall anſwer, that it is a *notorious and well known falſehood*. That a miracle cannot be of *human original*; it muſt be a work above the *art* and *power* of man to perform: and that the Scriptures record many above the power of the devil to perform; and that he himſelf did acknowledge the *power*, by

which

which Moſes acted to be that of God ; and that no books in the world are ſo *well atteſted* as the Bible is ; and that, on many accounts which it is to be wiſhed he would learn from our Divines. Neither *Pagan* nor *Popiſh* miracles have a ſufficiently *powerful teſtimony* in their favour. This advantage, ſo weakly and contrary to the known truth, flung into the hands of our profeſſed enemies, ſhews, that though the Gentleman may be a well-wiſher to *reaſoning*, he is either none to our church, or he doth not know what he is about.—*Innumerable miracles in the Popiſh legends, as ſtrongly affirmed, and as well atteſted, as any matters of fact can be*, as the dividing the Red Sea, God's talking with Moſes, in the hearing of a whole nation, or Chriſt's reſurrection, ſuppoſe ; and will not this Gentleman turn Papiſt upon the authority of *innumerable miracles as well atteſted* as thoſe of Moſes and Chriſt ? What a bog has his *ignis fatuus*, he calls *Reaſon*, drawn him into ? I am ſorry he is ſo little acquainted with *Hiſtory*, and has ſo little conſidered the *peculiar* circumſtances attending the hiſtoric evidence, and authenticity of the Bible, beyond that of any other book or books ; but am amazed that any man can be ſo hardened, as to openly profeſs that *innumerable miracles, the beſt atteſted poſſible*, ſhall not convince him of the divine commiſſion of thoſe who work them. This not only leads to Popery, as it allows miracles to be innumerable, and the beſt atteſted imaginable ; but to the diſbelief

of

of all Religion, by deſtroying the *only plain and ſenſible evidence* of the extraordinary interpoſition of the power of God. No man can give proof of his coming in the name of God, if *innumerable miracles* are not proof. How were Pharaoh and the Egyptians to blame, in not believing Moſes, that God had ſent him, if *innumerable miracles* were not ſufficient evidence? If Mr. Heathcote doth not argue here againſt reaſon and common ſenſe, and juſtly deſerve ſome of that coarſe language he has beſtowed on the H———ns, he need not be afraid of ever being deemed fool or knave.

Nor does he mend upon us, as he goes on: He tells us, p. 45.

That there have been jugglers in playing tricks formerly, as there are in reaſoning now.

" ——— We read of *Jannes* and *Jambres*, who *withſtood Moſes*,"

And confeſſed the finger of God in the miracles of Moſes; which Moſes did not confeſs in theirs.

" —— *Simon* bewitched the people of *Samaria* with his *ſorceries*," he ſays.

But *ſorceries* are not miracles; though he deems miracles no better than ſorceries. " Falſe prophets, he adds, were to ariſe, and ſhew great *ſigns and wonders*." But they were falſe ſigns and lying wonders; read 2 Theſſ. ii. 9. ". After the working of ſatan, with all power, and ſigns, and *lying wonders*." For ſhame, Sir, read your Bible to better purpoſe, than to cite it againſt *reaſon and common ſenſe*. Did God

God ever ſuffer falſe prophets to perform real great *ſigns* and true miracles, ſuch as he gave in teſtimony of his own word? Let him find out the man or men that did ſo. Falſe prophets were to mimick ſuch ſigns and wonders, as were ſufficient to deceive [not the elect, thoſe whoſe heart is not prone to the deceit, who obey the truth in the love of it; but] thoſe who love a lye, who believe not the truth, but have pleaſure in unrighteouſneſs.

Scripture is again halled in to bear evidence againſt itſelf, *reaſon* alone not being ſufficient to overturn it.

" St. Paul encourages the Galatians to withſtand even an *angel from heaven*, if he offered to preach *any ſtrange doctrines*."

The Apoſtle ſays, *any other goſpel than that which ye have received*, Gal. i. 9.

They were to judge then by the *outward word*, not by their *reaſon*, *natural notions*; or by any other *rule* than the *Goſpel:* and St. Paul makes that the teſt of all other doctrines; not only from man, but from an angel too, could he be ſuppoſed to come down to preach to us. " But *Reaſon* is more perfect than the angels of heaven, and the Apoſtle doth not include *Reaſon* in the prohibition. Reaſon may *teach* and control the goſpel of Chriſt; it is its teſt and judge." And accordingly we are bid, our Author obſerves, *to try the ſpirits*. But by what rule? our natural notions? No: St. John directs us to the ſame rule, the Goſpel.—" Every ſpirit that confeſſeth not that Jeſus

Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, is not of God," 1 John iv. 1. 2. Both the Apoſtles talk in the ſame *raving fanatic ſtrain*, of trying all doctrines by the Scriptures; and our Reaſoner cites Scripture contrary to the plain and obvious ſenſe of the words, to ſerve a turn: and to the plain and obvious deſign of a ſyſtem of laws and inſtructions from God, to be an *indiſputed* rule of faith and manners, for ſuch it muſt be, or nothing. The ſovereign authority of its great Author is ſtamped upon it; it carries the ſuperſcription of heaven; and if we give unto God the things that belong unto him, we muſt give him all or none. There can be no compromiſe here. The *Reaſon*, (to uſe a modern cant phraſe, inſtead of, the *Wiſdom*) of God, muſt be perfect; but the reaſon of man is liable to error, and therefore it cannot be the teſt or criterion of the truth and propriety of the word of God. Miracles and prophecies are plain, ſtriking, and intelligible proof of what came from God, and what did not. We expect no further revelation now; and it is not how we may know whether any future (pretended) revelation be from God; but whether the law of Moſes, and Goſpel, or hiſtory of Chriſt's completion of the law, be *true* and real hiſtory or no; and if either of them be proved ſo, both are proved ſo, they ſtand or fall together. The law was as old as Adam; and any future Religion muſt ſhew us its authority and commiſſion to ſuperſede that which was prior to it. And if Nimrod at Babel, or Mahomet at Meccha,

Meccha, have any ſuch commiſſion, let it be produced.

The wiſdom of God in adapting the *miracles* to the occaſions and circumſtances of the perſons and times, for which they were performed; and the divine mercy or juſtice apparent in them,—are circumſtances that ought always to be ſet forth, and are included in the argument from miracles; and it is groſs miſrepreſentation of Dr. Patten's ſentiments, to make him as Mr. Heathcote does, exclude a conſideration of them. *Miracles and propheſy* the doctor has in a manly manner, and ſtrong nervous ſtile, urged as the proper proofs of the divine Revelation; and Revelation as the proper teſt and Criterion of truth, and infallible rule of life and manners; and then with a ſtrain of piety, free from the Enthuſiaſtic flights of modern pretended inſpiration, preſſes upon us Chriſtian love and benevolence, as the only proof that the true faith liveth in us. And when Mr. Heathcote can equal him in ſtile or method, in ſenſe or piety; he will be far, far better entitled to our approbation, than his preſent performance promiſes he ever will be.

But to prove the divinity of the Scriptures from the miracles, is, he ſays, arguing in a circle; ſince *they are atteſted only by thoſe Scriptures*, p. 47. and then perſonating Dr. Patten, p. 48.

" I believe the Scriptures to be divine, becauſe they are confirmed by miracles; and I believe

believe the miracles to be *divine*, becauſe atteſted by the Scriptures."

Where does Dr. Patten argue ſo, or to this purpoſe? It is abuſe, and falſehood to ſay it. Mr. Heathcote has made ſome excurſions among the Infidels, and picked up a few Sophiſms, and is caught in the cobweb-wiles. I anſwer, we don't believe the *miracles to be divine, becauſe atteſted by the Scriptures*; but we believe them to have *been performed, becauſe atteſted by the Scriptures*; and the writers of Scripture to be inſpired, becauſe they ſaid ſo; and in proof performed ſuch miracles as are *divine*. The Scripture conſidered as a hiſtory, hath the ſame proof of its authenticity, or being written, when it ſays it was, as any other hiſtory. And the facts it relates muſt have been performed, or they could never have gained credit at the times, and been generally acknowledged by friends and foes. I hope our Author will ſee and acknowledge the falſeneſs of this charge, and the weakneſs of the Sophiſm, by which he is drawn away from the ſtrong hold of Chriſtianity. *They are dancing a fine round*, he ſays, I wiſh his own head do not turn round, and he take the wrong road at laſt, when he ſuffers himſelf to be led aſtray by ſuch wretched quibbles. And it is plain from what follows, that he has almoſt reaſoned himſelf, or rather diſputed himſelf, out of all conviction from the miracles; nay, almoſt of the belief of the facts.

" It muſt be remembered, he ſays, that they

[Celſus,

[Celſus, Julian, and Porphyry;] equally allowed of *Pagan* and *Chriſtian* miracles."

But is their allowing of the Pagan miracles, a proof that they were really performed? Or did friends and foes allow of the Pagan miracles, as they did of the Chriſtian? Would he inſinuate further, that the Chriſtian miracles have no advantage over the Pagans, either as their hiſtory ſtands in itſelf; or as the one are atteſted, by friends and foes both; and the other only by a few of themſelves? To ſpeak in Mr. Heathcote's way, *I affirm* there is no proof for *Pagan miracles*, or ſufficient evidence to receive them upon. Let Mr. Heathcote produce his reaſons for ſuch an infidel aſſertion; and if a better hand do not take up the pen, I ſhall be ready to ſhew the weakneſs of the aſſertion, and of his inference from it. He has been drinking up the dregs of infidelity, and is now throwing them out into the face of the Chriſtian church. He goes on:

" Miracles alone, inſtead of perſuading men to embrace Chriſtianity the firmer, muſt inſenſibly lead them not to embrace it at all," p. 49. and p. 52. depretiating, as far as he poſſibly could, the validity of the teſtimony we receive them upon; ſeems pleaſed with his own ſagacity in finding out reaſons for rejecting the goſpel miracles, and conſequently the new Teſtament; falls into his uſual abuſe, and compliments himſelf, for having got into the broad way; and then after a great deal of idle froth,

vents

vents another Sophiſm, which he has picked up in the infidel quarters, that

" Miracles have no power over doctrines, to make them true or falſe." p. 66.

He had but little ſenſe, whoever thought they had. But is not this the language of Infidels, when they would evade the divine authority of thoſe who performed them? Miracles alter not the nature of doctrines, any more than the credentials of an Ambaſſador, or commiſſion of an officer, do that of the men who receive them; but they give an authority they had not before. Miracles, ſuch as the Scriptures record, were proof of the *divine commiſſion*, of thoſe who wrought thoſe miracles, and where God is, there muſt be *truth* and *authority* alſo. Miracles are a proof of *power*; and if they are ſuch as God only can perform, they are proof that he who performs them, and ſays, God hath ſent him, is God's Ambaſſador. They are his credentials; and they are ſuch as God always gave, not to *alarm*, but to make men believe he had ſent,—*to confirm the word*; ſo ſays the Scripture, tho' Mr. Heathcote ſays otherwiſe. God ſays to Moſes, " if they will not believe thee, nor hearken to the voice of the firſt ſign, that they will believe the voice of the latter ſign." And Mark xvi. 20. " *Confirming* the word with ſigns following," and Heb. ii. 4. " God *bearing them witneſs*, both with ſigns and wonders, and with divers miracles." But Mr. Heathcote's reaſon tells him, that this is not true; that " miracles have no power over doctrines

doctrines to make them true or falſe, either of divine or diabolic origin, *becauſe we know* that they have been wrought by evil, as well as good ſpirits: but they are extremely proper to *alarm*.—"

If ſuch language from one in Chriſtian orders doth not alarm, God forgive them, whoſe buſineſs it is to be alarmed at it. He talks of *good and evil ſpirits* working miracles; the good ſpirit, who is Jehovah, wrought miracles, but we read of no other good ſpirit doing ſo; nor of any real miracles being wrought by the evil ſpirits; not ſuch wonders, however, as are ſufficient in any ſenſe to ballance the evidence ariſing from thoſe wrought by *the Lord the Spirit*. He is not a Chriſtian, who talks in this ſtrain, nor a man of ſenſe, who could ſo weakly think that miracles were ever deſigned to make doctrines true or falſe. Nor had he read his Bible, who could ſay, they were not deſigned for *evidence*, but only to *alarm*. God *bare witneſs* to the truth of the doctrines, by miracles; and he muſt be moſt wretchedly ſilly, who will not believe the *witneſs* of God, becauſe *miracles* have no power to alter the truth, or falſehood of a doctrine. It is the weakeſt and ſillieſt Sophiſm, in the whole armoury of infidelity; and ſaying that miracles are not evidence, becauſe

" They have been wrought by evil, as well as good ſpirits;"

is going a length, beyond which no Infidel ever yet went, nor indeed can go. It is lay-

ing a ſtumbling-block in the way of his, I will not ſay, weaker, for than in this inſtance no man can be a weaker, brother; can God bear witneſs to a falſehood? And is not a miracle God's witneſs? God ſays it is. And yet Mr. Heathcote does not care to believe it, tho' it may *alarm* him ſo far, as to bring what God has born evidence to, to the *bar of his reaſon*, to try it, whether it is true or no. Can any thing ſound more ſhocking to the ear of common ſenſe, than this does? The man that was born blind, Joh. ix. argues with the Phariſees—"Herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence he is, and yet he has opened mine eyes—Since the world began was it not heard, that any man opened the eyes of one born blind." And hence infers very rationally, "If this man were not of God, he could do nothing."

Miracles are an appeal to our ſenſes, that he that does them is of God. He cites *Lactantius*, lib. 5. §. 3. who ſays, "We do not believe Chriſt to be God, *only* becauſe he worked miracles; but alſo, becauſe he fulfilled what was predicted of him." Chriſt was not only to work ſuch works, as were ſufficient to prove him to be the Chriſt; but alſo to perform ſuch works as were predicted of him, which was not the caſe of any other Prophet; and if he had worked miracles, but not thoſe that were predicted, they could not have been evidence for him; and ſo Lactantius adds, "We might then have thought him a Magician, as the Heathens and

Jews

Jews do, if all the Prophets had not predicted, he ſhould perform thoſe very works; and therefore we believe him to be God, *not more* for his deeds and wonderful works, than from the very croſs itſelf, becauſe it was predicted." He ſtrengthens the argument from miracles, with that from propheſy; but is ſo far from ſaying that miracles were not *evidence*, as being God's *teſtimony* to the truth of what Chriſt and the Prophets ſaid, that he twice allows in this paſſage that they were——" We *not only* believe Chriſt to be God, becauſe he worked miracles, but &c.—therefore we believe him to be God, *not more* for the deeds and wonderful works, than &c." Would or did *Lactantius* take Moſes for a Magician, becauſe his miracles were not predicted? If he did not, then hath Mr. Heathcote cited him contrary to his intention, as well as plain words. Dr. *Jortin*'s is a very juſt remark, and the truth of the caſe, that *miracles cannot directly prove the truth, or falſehood of any doctrine:* but ſtill they are God's *teſtimony* to the truth of the doctrine, and put an end to the doubt we might be in, about the truth of it; becauſe God is a God of truth, and can't ſet his ſeal to what is not true. And Mr. Heathcote might have known, that none but Infidels ſtate the argument from miracles, in this manner he has done, which is a Sophiſtical evaſion of the force of their evidence.

And ſo much for the uſe of Reaſon in Religion, which our Author has ſo far miſtaken as to ſet it up for *maſter*, where it can only be

ſcholar. And becauſe ſome, who have more duly conſidered the matter, maintain that reaſon is only a capacity of being taught, he abuſes them for deſtroying it; and from an over eagerneſs of diſpute, has borrowed all his ſtrength from thoſe infidel Sophiſms, by which the force of all thoſe mighty wonders, ſo great in kind and number, by which God bore evidence to the Prophets and Apoſtles, is evaded and unhappily rendered uſeleſs, to thoſe who are ſo weak as to imbibe them.

I ſhall now turn myſelf to what is perſonal, with regard to Mr. H——n, who tho' dead and gone, and out of the reach of fiery tongues, and the darts of envenomed words, himſelf is abuſed in the moſt virulent manner, as a mover of ſedition, and a ſtirrer up of ſtrife and contention, in order to derive the hatred and jealouſy, as well as the power of the government, upon thoſe who read his writings; writings, which are calculated only to eſtabliſh Religion, and learning upon a ſolid footing, and reſcue them out of the hands of a parcel of *natural Enthuſiaſts*, who aſcribe as much, if not more authority to their own reaſon, than even the *Methodiſts* and *Quakers* do to their imaginary indwelling God within them. Mr. Hutchinſon meddles not with government, nor advances any thing but what tends to make men better ſubjects, than *Enthuſiaſm*, *natural* or *ſpiritual*, can poſſibly do. A government is in danger, from your natural Enthuſiaſts. He that dares ſay to God, I will judge whether what you ſay be worthy

worthy of you or not, and be fitting for me to do, wants but the power to ſay the ſame to his king and country. It is a fifth-monarchy principle; and policy, meer ſelf-defence, ſhould direct every government, to keep the ſtricteſt eye and hand upon all ſuch preſumption, not only as ſubjects themſelves of God, who is thus ininſulted by their ſubjects; and as his vicegerents, whoſe authority they bear, and whoſe honour, it will be expected, they ſhould vindicate; but as governors themſelves, who would be obeyed by the people committed to their charge, which it is impoſſible that he, who has a right to try the law of God, ſhould do willingly, and of affection. If I may call the laws of God *to the bar of my reaſon*, ſurely I may the laws of man; and if my reaſon and that of the law-givers ſhould happen to differ, [and it is very poſſible I may not be quite ſo wiſe as my betters] it follows that I have a right to diſpute the authority of that law, or elſe I had no right to try the goodneſs of it: ſo that the *men of reaſon*, as your *natural Enthuſiaſts* call themſelves, are of all men the moſt to be feared in any government, and the moſt to be guarded againſt.

The real quarrel of Mr. Heathcote againſt Mr. H——n is for ſetting up the Scriptures as the ſole rule of faith, which he cannot mention with patience or decency, ſo far has he forgot that veneration, which is due to the *word of God*, and the obligation he lies under, as a member of the eſtabliſhed church, and by his

ſubſcription at taking orders, to maintain that *controverſies are to be decided by Scripture*; and that true Proteſtants, muſt, as Chillingworth ſays, *really and ſincerely ſubmit their judgments to Scripture, and that only*; *captivating their underſtandings to that only*; ſays Mr. Chillingworth: So ſtrongly does he word himſelf, in behalf of the authority of the word of God, tho' produced by Mr. Heathcote, as a witneſs on his ſide. Mr. Heathcote is, to all intents and purpoſes, a Papiſt, with reſpect to the authority of the ſacred Scriptures; for by ſetting up any authority over them, he defeats their uſe, as much as the Papiſts do; and does but ſubſtitute the word *Reaſon* for *Church* in our books of controverſy with the *Papiſts*, concerning the rule of Faith, and every argument they urge againſt the Papiſt holds equally ſtrong againſt the *Rationaliſt*; it being as derogatory to the honour of God, and the nature of his Word, as a rule, to make it ſubmit to *Reaſon*, as to the *Church*, i. e. to the judgment of one man, as to the judgments of ten million. An infallible guide in every breaſt ſets up as many Popes, as there are people; and errors muſt neceſſarily multiply, in proportion to the number of falſe guides. The church of God taught, at our Lord's appearing, for *doctrines* the *commandments of men*, and thence were led to renounce their Saviour, and crucify him. And what are the dictates of our own Reaſon but the commandments of men? And will not the ſame falſe guides lead us into the ſame errors

errors again? To what do we aſcribe the errors of Popery, the madneſs of Quakery, the apoſtacy of the Jews and Deiſts, &c. but the ſetting up *ſomething elſe* for a rule, beſides the Word of God? We can't, in reaſon, but allow that Papiſts, Quakers, Jews, and Deiſts think themſelves right, and may be as fully convinced of the truth of their opinions, as the Rationaliſt or natural Enthuſiaſt is of his. They can't all ſin with their eyes open, but they all forſake their proper guide, and are anſwerable for the conſequence. Chriſt refers us to the original Hebrew Scriptures, as they *which teſtify of him*. Our going thither is matter of reproach with Mr. Heathcote. He calls us a ſort of *cabaliſtical* * *decypherers, who do all their mighty works by their great knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures*; and then falls upon Mr. Hutchinſon, in a manner conſiſtent enough with himſelf. He is angry at the great diſcoveries we aſcribe to Mr. H———n, in the philoſophy and hieroglyphics of the Scripture. Philoſophy is a touch-ſtone to try the goodneſs of his gold by. It is the ſubject of our ſenſes, and comes under the cogniſance of the judge, he would ſet up as ſovereign over all truth. Let Mr. Heathcote enter into this field of en-

* This is a term of reproach, applied by that arch-infidel Lord Bol———ke to St. Paul, and borrowed from him by Dr. Warburton, and applied, to ſhew his judgment and value for the Scriptures, to Mr. H—n, for the ſame reaſon the other abuſed the Apoſtle with it, in his referring to the type and ceremonies of the law, as predictive and explanatory of the mediatorial ſcheme.

quiry with the H——ns; and if he can ſupport the Newtonian, or overturn the Scripture Philoſophy, let him cenſure the Editors for ſaying Mr. H——n "has taken off the veil from Moſes and the Prophets, and opened the ſecrets of philoſophy." But here I muſt caution the Reader not to truſt Mr. Heathcote's citations, though put in Italicks, and given us the words and ſenſe of what he cavils at, there being ſcarce *one fair quotation* in his whole piece.

He ſeems to think the hieroglyphics have been looked into before, for *Chriſtianity*, by cenſuring the Editors, for ſaying, they had not, that *they knew of*. If they are miſtaken, they will be glad to be ſhewn the man or men, that have done ſo; and the more that have done ſo, the more pleaſure it will give them; that theſe important *Records* may be looked into, with leſs prejudice, and more ſeriouſly and attentively. As Mr. Heathcote hath taken up the pen with great zeal, to ſay no worſe, and cenſures with unuſual warmth and language, let him take into conſideration, *The Enquiry after Philoſophy and Theology*, for thoſe parts of Mr. H——n's diſcoveries; and the Eſſay on the Hieroglyphicks, entitled, *Similitudes of the Lord God*, for his happy illuſtration of the moſt abſtruſe parts of Scripture there,

Our Author comes to Mr. H——n's moral character, which he makes no objection to, but adds, p. 85.

"It is ſaid — that he never offended with his

his tongue; never ſpake with more warmth than is ſtrictly juſtifiable."

This is a downright falſehood: what the Editor ſays, is, Preface, p. 11.

"That he never offended with his tongue —— *we ſay not.*"

This falſe citation is twice made, and as if he were determined it ſhould not be thought an overſight, he ſubjoins part of another ſentence above to this, and omits, *we ſay not.* The whole drift of the Editors, in this and the following page, is to make the proper excuſe for an unguarded expreſſion or two; and ſome little ſallies of temper, not ſo ſtrictly juſtifiable, perhaps; at leaſt, which the Editors were ſorry for, becauſe they would not have his adverſaries have had any thing they could have compared themſelves to him in, with any advantage. When the Author * had got thus far, he was ſo happy, as to get a ſight of Dr. Patten's moſt excellent Defence of *The Chriſtian Apology*, againſt Mr. Heathcote's *Miſrepreſentations* and exceptions, and of Mr. Horn's *Apology*; two incomparable performances; which have both pointed out this miſquotation to him:

* Who, the Reader will perceive is ſo happy as to concur in his ſentiments with thoſe two learned gentlemen; and in many of the remarks; that he may ſeem to have borrowed them from them; and though he is ſenſible how much he muſt ſuffer *as a writer*, upon the compariſon, in the opinion of others, yet it is with pleaſure he ſees himſelf their ſuperiority, and chuſes to let this go as it is, truth; and not character, being his motive of writing, as it is evidently theirs.

and

and what will the Reader ſay, to this falſe man, who, upon this, readvertiſes his pamphlet, and in *Italicks*, that *he had made fair quotations!*

But now for Mr. H——n's *Principles and opinions, to detect and lay open the real ſources of this new divinity*, which takes the Word of God for its guide; and real nature, for the character or letters to read the leſſon in.

The firſt is, that *The Religion of nature is the Religion of the devil*; and his blaſpheming *Woolaſton's Delineation*, with the ſimilar title of *The Religion of Satan delineated.* A ſad thing, to abuſe ſo good a performance, and call that a lie, which has the word *Truth* in every page, nay, line almoſt, only becauſe there is not a *word of truth in it.* "Conformable to this notion, continues Mr. Heathcote, he always diſtinguiſhes the late Dr. Clarke, and others, who have been advocates for natural Religion, by the name and character of *Apoſtates from Chriſtianity*," p. 87.

Which is not true; for though he has proved that the God, which Clarke and others would ſet up, was Jupiter, the air, and *the ſuppoſed intelligence in it*; and *that they took their divinity from the Heathens*, yet the term *Apoſtates* he appropriates, [if I remember right] to the *apoſtate Jews*; and as Mr. H——n has cited many paſſages, and refers to others, to prove, *that* Dr. Clarke's *Divinity was that of the Heathens*, our Author ſhould have *refuted the charge*, before he has any right to ſcold upon it; and as no body has yet undertaken the defence

defence of Dr. Clarke, in this *material point*, Mr. Heathcote has an opportunity of doing a ſignal piece of ſervice to *Natural Religion*, if he can clear it from the idolatry charged upon it, of worſhipping the imaginary God of the lateſt and moſt ignorant of the Heathens. This is renouncing Chriſtianity; but the *Apoſtates* in Mr. H——n are the wicked Jews. And here I muſt point out another falſe citation, which an honeſt man would bluſh at. It is in the margin, p. 87.

"The ſtate of ſuch Apoſtates, ſays Dr. Hodges, borders upon deſpair, which is the condition of the devil and his angels. *Chriſtian Plan*, p. 15."

Is not Dr. Hodges talking there of our profeſſed Infidels, in contradiſtinction to the contenders for natural Religion? Does he ſpeak of Dr. Clarke, and ſuch as follow him? No. He is talking of men, *who reject and deſpiſe all the means of grace*, not of thoſe, who are miſtaken in their ſentiments about it. I am at a loſs for words to expreſs the baſeneſs of ſuch miſrepreſentations, when the deſign is to repreſent one of the moſt amiable diſpoſitions in a light ſo odious. The Doctor, from his heart, all along pities the natural Religioniſt; treats him as miſtaken; feels for his error; and trembles at the conſequences. Natural Religion leads indeed to the worſt of conſequences, and carries a man to lengths, that at firſt ſtarting, he would tremble at the mention of. But the Doctor does not conſider him as having already run

thoſe

thoſe lengths, but only cautions him of the bogs and precipices his blind road will lead him into.

A citation is made, p. 89, 90. from the *Religion of Satan*, that *Dr.* —— *has infected Dr. &c.* and at which, offence is pretended to be taken. They are not D. D's. but M. D's. that are pointed at; whether with or without reaſon, they who are a little better acquainted with the —— world, than Mr. Heathcote poſſibly may yet be, are the beſt judges. But when he makes Mr. H——n ſay, that Atheiſts and Deiſts acknowledge the *authority of Scripture, upon the principles of natural Religion*, he neither ſhews his ſenſe nor common honeſty. *Atheiſts* and *Deiſts* do not acknowledge the *authority of Scripture*, upon any principles, whether of natural Religion or any thing elſe. Mr. H—n is talking of thoſe, who *reject the authority of Scripture*; and for Mr. Heathcote to bend what he ſays of them, and apply it to thoſe modern divines, who, with revealed Religion, have entertained a ſet of notions, they ſuppoſe diſcoverable by the light of nature, and ſo to apply what Mr. H——n ſays of Atheiſts and Deiſts to Chriſtian Divines, ſhews want of common honeſty in the accuſer. Whatever opinion Mr. H——n had, or his Editors may have, of what is called natural Religion; and whatever offence, the contempt they hold it in, may give Mr. Heathcote, he ſhould beware of falſe acccuſations, and keep clear, at leaſt of palpable blunders, ſuch as this head of complaint contains; one would think a little common ſenſe might have diſtinguiſhed betwixt Atheiſts and Deiſts, who wholly

wholly reject Scripture; and ſuch perſons, who receive it as *divine*, tho' they build it upon a foundation they think not good. Let any reader judge whether the accuſer was not more angry than wiſe here, and in ſo great a hurry to condemn, that he had not given himſelf time to know what he found fault with.

Mr. H—n held the Scriptures in the higheſt veneration, and looked upon them, as our church does, as *the ſole rule of faith and manners*; without excluding any more than our church does, the uſe of our ſenſe and underſtanding, in interpreting them, or coming at their meaning; which is the idleſt and ſillieſt complaint againſt him imaginable; and whether the *word of God*, or reaſoning out of our own heads, may contribute moſt to the ſupport of Religion, if time has not already ſhewn, it too ſoon will.

And now ariſes a charge, p. 91. againſt Mr. H—n of a different kind, that his principles are deſtructive, of *the ends of civil government, and the peace and well being of ſociety.* And why? becauſe the *apoſtate Jews*, he thought, ought not to be tolerated in any Chriſtian country. And any one, who duly conſiders their curſed principles, and what a deluge of divine wrath they drew down, in the churches of God in the eaſt; and the deplorable ſlavery Chriſtian princes live in, under the feet of that Anti-Chriſt, Mahomet, to this day, may juſtly dread the fatal conſequences of their infuſing the ſame Anti-Chriſtian ſpirit into theſe kingdoms, which muſt neceſſarily be followed by the ſame or like viſita-

viſitation. Mahomet is ſo exact an image of the *Meſſiah*, the Apoſtates pretend to expect; and the *Arian*-Chriſt ſomething ſo like a *Mahomet*, that we can't help reading this crime of the eaſtern churches in their puniſhment, and trembling for the weſtern, in proportion, as the ſame mock Meſſiah prevails over the faith in him, who is God and man. As to our behaviour towards the apoſtate Jews, or profeſſed Infidels; the apoſtolical injunction is pretty clear and poſitive; 2 Joh. v. 10. — "Receive him not into your houſe, neither bid him God ſpeed, for he that biddeth him God ſpeed, is partaker of his evil deeds." But Mr. Heathcote ſays, that the treating of theſe Apoſtates,

"Is a point of a very nice and delicate nature, and has uſually been managed with great tenderneſs and caution."

I need only refer him to that incomparable pamphlet, publiſhed at the time the Jew act was depending in the houſe, and ſaid to be wrote by an eminent citizen; and which was publiſhed, as containing the ſenſe of the city of London, on ſo extraordinary a bill. And he will ſee there, how far he is miſtaken, as to the nicety of this point; and in what manner, theſe enemies of Chriſt, and his kingdom ought to be treated by Chriſtians, and in general have been. The reader may ſee in Mr. H——n's *Hebrew writings perfect*, a true character of theſe wretches, and their tenets, from the moſt authentic authorities. But it is plain, the gentleman had no mind to reaſon here, but rail, and

to

to that purpoſe twiſts the paſſages he cites from their obvious meaning; and applies to one ſet of people, what is ſpoken of another, as p. 94. he applies again to Clarke, Woollaſton, and Conybeare, what is ſpoken of profeſſed Infidels and Blaſphemers. And adds

" Our moderation, he [Mr. H—n] declares to be quite inexcuſable."

A great man in the houſe of Commons, calling ſomething that was aſſerted in the houſe, a lie, excuſed himſelf by ſaying, he knew no properer word for a lie, than that. And if the reader can find any properer name for the above falſehood, he may, I cannot; our *moderation* is ſo far from extending to *Blaſphemy*, that it does not extend to Arianiſm or Socinianiſm; all ſects being obliged to ſubſcribe to the doctrine of the ever bleſſed Trinity, as they were, even in the worſt part of the grand Rebellion; much leſs would it permit men to blaſpheme that holy name, by which we are called and ſaved, as the Apoſtates and other profeſſed Infidels do on all occaſions. There is ſomething ſo malevolent, as well as falſe, in this way of charging an adverſary, that I imagine the reader will think it its own confutation; and that the beſt way of anſwering is to deſpiſe one, who could ſink himſelf ſo low.

Next follows another miſquotation from Mr. H—n, tacked to a ſentence it does not belong to. That,

" It is a curſed reflection upon any right, or pro-

proceeding, to ſuggeſt, that Chriſtians *can* join in it." p. 95.

Which he ſays, is ſenſe and truth; and that *cannot join in it*, as it is in Mr. H——n, is nonſenſe; and aſcribes the text, as it ſtands, to the negligence of the Printer, or prudence of the Editors,

" Who were wiſe enough to know, that it was ſafer to write nonſenſe.——"

It being a reflection upon any proceeding, according to their accuſer, to ſuggeſt that Chriſtians *can* join in it.

"——*Than to ſtir up ſedition*," by ſaying there are ſome proceedings, which Chriſtians ought not to join in; and that it is our duty to contend earneſtly for the faith. Hath this gentleman his eye upon the *Quaker*, and *Jew* bills? And is he ſo far loſt to all ſenſe of Religion, and the conſequences of thoſe bills, on the peace and happineſs of the people, here and hereafter, as to wickedly and meanly flatter any meaſures, which men regardleſs of, or thoughtleſs about Religion, may unadviſedly enter into? Tho' the one tended apparently to the ruin of the eſtabliſhed church, by making it the intereſt of ſo many thouſands to turn Quakers; which muſt in the courſe of a few years, have perverted to that blaſphemous, no—Religion, all the lower occupiers of land in the kingdom, and impoveriſhed the whole body of parochial clergy; and the other to incorporate into a Chriſtian ſociety, a ſet of men, as oppoſite to us, as darkneſs to light; and more contagious, and

and more to be dreaded than men infected with the plague. I ſhall only ſay with Lactantius,

O Philoſophum adulatorem ac tempori ſervientem!

And I hope what follows will prove as true of our, as of that father's adverſary,

Hic pro ſuâ inanitate contemptus eſt; qui & gratiam, quam ſperavit, non eſt adeptus; & gloria, quem captavit, in culpam, reprehenſionemque converſa eſt. Lib. 5. §. 2.

And what ſort of a Chriſtian muſt he be, who has not courage to ſpeak in defence of the fundamentals of Chriſtianity, leſt he give offence; and would flatter men in the error of their way, leſt he diſturb their repoſe? The eyes of the nation are now open, with regard to the Quaker-bill, and can ſee now what temporal miſchiefs muſt have followed, by adding to the unaccountable priviledges, and *impolitic* encouragement given to that blaſpheming, ſtubborn and refractory ſet of people. We need but caſt our eyes on *Penſylvania*, and ſee what Quakeriſm is in the ſtate! It is they, and thoſe who plead for them, that are enemies to the peace and happineſs of ſociety *.

But the charge of ſtirring up *ſedition* is a wicked and malitious one. Could the barking of ſuch—reach the ear of power, what might we expect, does he hope, leſs than *the fire and ſword, racks and inquiſition*, his frightened imagination hath conjured up out of a true, honeſt

* See their portraiture, in Mr. Dove's Eſſay on Inſpiration, and the Supplement.

and Chriſtian zeal, againſt blaſphemy and blaſphemers? againſt profeſt Infidels, and ſuch as not only deny, but mock at the Lord who bought them? Nor does he ſhew leſs ignorance of our laws; or reflect on our preſent governours of the church, with leſs ſeverity, than he does on Mr. H——n. If the impriſonment and puniſhment of a Woolſton, or the publiſher of a prophane infidel pamphlet, or infamous libel, be not a breach of charity, and offence againſt our moderation the diſcouraging as much as poſſible the blaſphemy of the Quakers and Jews, can never be charged on that head. But Mr. Heathcote makes the ſame outcry againſt Mr. H——n, and thoſe who make the Scriptures the rule of their faith, the Jews did againſt Chriſtianity, at firſt—*they are enemies to the ſtate, no friends to Cæſar; turners of the world upſide down; deceivers of the people; and ſtirrers up of ſedition.* So concludes our good man his charge.

" A perſecutor of the brethren." p. 99.

Viz. Apoſtates, Quakers, and profeſſed Infidels. Theſe muſt be Mr. Heathcote's brethren; for theſe are the perſons, Mr. H——n thought ſhould not be permitted in any Chriſtian ſtate.

" ——A diſturber of the peace of ſociety."—

It being better the whole body ſhould periſh, than one mortified limb ſhould be lopped off: nor that proper remedies ſhould be applied, leſt the body be put to pain, and the ſtomach offended.

"——A

" —A contemner of all human learning."—
Read his writings, and you will be forced to confeſs, in ſpight of prejudice, that he was a thorough judge of what was valuable in *human*, and deſpiſed no part of *real* learning. He concludes;

" In ſhort, a Fanatic in the church, and Rebel in the ſtate."

And as ſuch, either the Hutchinſonians ought to be hanged up, or their accuſer. Theſe are bitter cenſures, and uncharitable imputations. A Rebel in the ſtate, cuſtom authoriſes me to ſay, deſerves death; and I ſhall take the liberty to ſay, that no fanatic, or pretender to inſpiration, ought to be permitted among Chriſtians; if they are, it will not be long before they will not permit Chriſtians to be amongſt them. This we had an inſtance of a few years ago. A *Fanatic* is one, who pretends to be inſpired; this Mr. Heathcote ſays he is; this Mr. H—n denies that any body is; he is therefore the *Fanatic* himſelf, and let him keep the cap where it is; it ſuits his own head beſt. *The moment a man quits* Scripture, *he becomes a prey to fanaticiſm: then every conceit, which a wild and diſordered imagination can ſuggeſt, is the effect of inſpiration; is, in ſhort, true Religion,* and true allegiance too: witneſs the grand Rebellion, and the honours paid to the church, the king, the parliament, and the univerſities; and the ſtrange and contradictory doctrines then advanced as the true Religion; and all upon the ſame authority, Mr. Heathcote now

builds upon, *internal inſpiration.* Every man was then inſpired; and every man was then a Rebel.

I ſpeak not of the firſt oppoſition, or ſtand, made againſt illegal encroachments, or arbitrary miniſterial oppreſſions; but of that fanatic rabble, who lodged themſelves in the ruins of thoſe noble buildings, which the wrath of God had thrown down. They trampled upon the law of God, and the law of the land, with the ſame foot, and ſpurned before them every thing, which God, or their Governors had eſtabliſhed, which the *ſpirit in them* [i. e. *natural inſpiration*, for it could not be from God, being ſolely from themſelves] did not approve of. Mr. Heathcote could not have ſhewn his want of judgment and charity, more than he has done in this weak and ill-grounded cenſure; nor can he poſſibly avoid the retaliation, of being charged himſelf with being a *Fanatic in the church, and a Rebel in the ſtate*, by principle; whatever he may have the courage and reſolution to be in action. Jack, ſays a Gentleman to his Friend, what makes you look ſo ſour? Why, I have been in company where they called me rogue and fool. Well, what then, why did not you call them ſo again? I did; but they proved me ſuch. This is our inſpired Friend's caſe; he has called us *Fanatics* and *Rebels*; I have proved him a *Fanatic* by his own confeſſion, and appeal to hiſtory, that all of that tribe were always *Rebels*, when they were ſtrong enough.

The

The ground of all this heat againſt Mr. H——n, is confeſſed here again, p. 100. to be his oppoſing what they call *natural Religion*; and let Mr. H——n ſtand or fall by *this one* teſt. The idol is ſet up in the hearts of too many; and the majority may perhaps be at preſent againſt us. But let them lay aſide *fire, and ſword, war, bloodſhed, rebellion, ſeditions, inquiſitions*, and the whole armour of diſputation, *with the other evidences of their meek and quiet diſpoſition*, and calmly argue this point, whether *Reaſon be Maſter or Scholar*; be to take its information from the Bible, to be guided and governed by it, or be to ſit Lord and judge over it; and after that, we will enquire who are the Fanatics and Rebels; and what treatment, infidelity, apoſtacy, and blaſphemy ought to receive. We pity men, who have got the plague, but ſhut them off from ourſelves leſt we catch the infection. And let me beg of Mr. Heathcote, or whoever may take up the pen for him, to make a diſtinction or two, which have quite eſcaped him: That, *to ſearch the Scriptures*, is not *to ſit judge over them.* That, *to be guided by Scripture*, is not *giving up our reaſon*, but uſing it properly. That, *to contend earneſtly for the faith*, is not *contending out of ſtrife and vain glory.* And when Mr. H——n recommended the firſt, he ſhould not be abuſed for doing the latter, as if one implied the other. And, laſtly, that he would be pleaſed to make that diſtinction betwixt Apoſtates, profeſſed Infidels, and Blaſphemers, and

and *people miſtaken in leſſer points*, which Mr. H---n always does; and not twiſt what is ſaid of the firſt, and apply it to the latter, for reaſons very obvious, but not very becoming: and I beg of him to ſet us an example of *good manners*, in both ſenſes of the phraſe, meekneſs and charity, which is their ſtrongeſt enforcement. I wiſh him no ill; and hope he will be able to do us none, notwithſtanding the ſtrong effort he is making to raiſe a perſecution againſt us, out of his great deteſtation of perſecution, and ſuperabundant charity.

N. B. The Publiſher recommends this to Mr Dodd's conſideration, that he may be no longer *one of thoſe, who ſay and do not.*

BRITISH
19 JY 77
MUSEUM

F I N I S.